From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism

Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha

ANDREI A. ORLOV

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM [114]

BRILL

From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism

Supplements

to the

Journal for the Study of Judaism

Editor

John J. Collins

The Divinity School, Yale University

Associate Editor

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Advisory Board

J. DUHAIME – A. HILHORST – P.W. VAN DER HORST

A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN – M.A. KNIBB – H. NAJMAN

J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN – J.SIEVERS – G. STEMBERGER

E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR – J. TROMP

VOLUME 114

From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism

Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha

by

Andrei A. Orlov

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Orlov, Andrei A., 1960–
From apocalypticism to Merkabah mysticism : studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha / by Andrei A. Orlov.
From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha
p. cm. – (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism, ISSN 1384-2161 ; v. 114)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and indexes
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15439-1 (alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 90-04-15439-6 (alk. paper)
1. Apocryphal books–Translations into Slavic–History and criticism. 2. Apocryphal books–Translations into Slavic–Bibliography. I. Title.

BS1700.O77 2006
229'.91–dc22

2006047336

ISSN 1384-2161
ISBN 90 04 15439 6

© Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For my teachers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface xi
Location of the Original Publications xiii

PART ONE

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND RELATED LITERATURE

I. Slavonic Pseudepigrapha 3
1. Collections of the Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts 3
2. Collections of the Translations of the Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts 4
3. Bibliographies of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha 5
4. Pseudepigrapha 7
Fragment "Seventy Names of God" 7
Fragment "About All Creation" 7
Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve 7
The Story of God's Creation of Adam 9
Adam Octipartite 11
Adamic Fragments in the Apocryphal Circle about the Tree of the Cross 12
Adamic Fragments in the Discourse of the Three Hierarchs 14
The Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus 16
Sataniel Text (Tentatio Adae et Evae a Satanael) 17
Adamic and Sataniel Fragments in the Legend about the Tiberian Sea 17
The Apocryphon about the Struggle of the Archangel Michael with Sataniel 18
2 Enoch 19
Enochic Fragment about the Two Tablets 35
Fragment "About the Flood" 35
Apocalypse of Abraham 36
Testament of Abraham 43

Apocryphal Fragments about Melchizedek 45
The Ladder of Jacob 46
Joseph and Aseneth 48
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 48
Testament of Job 49
Life of Moses 50
Apocryphal Fragments about David 52
Apocryphal Fragments about Solomon 54
Apocryphal Fragments about Elijah 56
Ascension of Isaiah 57
3 Baruch 59
4 Baruch 63
Pseudo-Danielic Fragments 64
Apocalypse of Zosimus 66
Ahiqar 66
The Word of the Blessed Zerubabel 68
The Josippon 68
Palaea Historica 71
Explanatory Palaea 72
Palaea Chronographica 74

II. Related Studies 77
1. Jewish Pseudepigraphical Works and Traditions in Slavic Milieux 77
2. "Prohibited Books" 93
3. Bogomilism and the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha 96

PART TWO

STUDIES IN THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Introduction 103

THE ENOCH TRADITION

Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: "Two Tablets" Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica* 109
Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2(Slavonic) Enoch* 133
"Without Measure and Without Analogy": The Tradition of the Divine Body in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 149

Secrets of Creation in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 175
Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition 197
The Origin of the Name "Metatron" and the Text of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 223
Resurrection of Adam's Body: The Redeeming Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 231

THE ADAM TRADITION

On the Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich 239
"Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One": Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies 269
The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants* 289

THE MOSES TRADITION

Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition 311
Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies .. 327
The Heirs of the Enochic Lore: "Men of Faith" in *2 Enoch* 35:2 and *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10 345

THE NOAH TRADITION

"Noah's Younger Brother": The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 361
Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 379

THE JACOB TRADITION

The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* 399

THE MELCHIZEDEK TRADITION

Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 423

Bibliography 441

Index of Sources 465
Modern Author Index 477

PREFACE

This book contains several essays previously published in journals inaccessible to many interested readers. I am thankful to the editors of these journals for permission to re-use the material.

The format and the style of the original publications have been changed to comply with the standards of the collection. Some alterations also have been made due to printing errors or obvious errors of fact. Some footnotes have been omitted as they appeared in more than one article. Slavonic citations of *2 Enoch* have been standardized where it is possible in accordance with Sokolov's edition. All Russian bibliographical references are given according to the new orthography.

While numerous bibliographical tools were consulted in preparation of the bibliographical section on Slavonic pseudepigrapha, special recognition is due to Lorenzo DiTommaso's *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999* (JSPSS, 39; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) and Dmitrij Lihachev's *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (Ленинград, 1987–89).

I owe special thanks to my colleagues at the Department of Theology of Marquette University for their continued human and scholarly support and encouragement.

I would like to express my appreciation to Pat Anderson, Bogdan Bucur, Silviu Bunta, Christopher Dorn, Rachel Elior, Basil Lourié, Oleg Makariev, Nikolai Seleznyov, and Lisa Stephenson who read the manuscript and offered numerous helpful suggestions. I also wish to thank Dragos Giulea for his assistance in compiling the indexes.

I am grateful to Prof. John J. Collins for accepting this study for the Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. I am also indebted to Ms Mattie Kuiper and Ms Willy de Gijzel for their help, patience and professionalism during preparation of this book for publication.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this work to my teachers whose wisdom, knowledge and understanding have helped direct and shape the contents of these pages.

Andrei Orlov
Milwaukee
Feast of the Transfiguration 2006

LOCATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

"Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 71–86.

"Secrets of Creation in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.

"Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 39 (2000) 130–147.

"Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38.

"'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.

"The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch*," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000) 19–26.

"Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: 'Two Tablets' Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica*," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001) 137–158.

"'Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One': Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies," *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001) 281–298 (with Alexander Golitzin).

"The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants*," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003) 184–201.

"On the Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303.

"Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14.1 (2004) 3–24.

"The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in: *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 2.59–76.

"Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.

"'Without Measure and Without Analogy': The Tradition of the Divine Body in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56.2 (2005) 224–244.

"Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," in: "Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)," *Xristianskij Vostok* 4.10 (2006) 498–513.

"The Heirs of the Enochic Lore: 'Men of Faith' in *2 Enoch* 35:2 and *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10," in: *Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (Eds. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich) (forthcoming).

"Resurrection of Adam's Body: The Redeeming Role of Enoch-Metatron in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*" (unpublished).

PART ONE

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND RELATED LITERATURE

I

SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

1. *Collections of the Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература* (*IX–XVIII*) *въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922).

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910).

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]).

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868).

Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]).

Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.1–413.

Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) (Лихачев Д.С., Дмитриева, Л.А.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (т. 1–12; Москва, 1978–1992).

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999).

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) *Примери књижевности и језика старога и српско-словенскога* (I. Ausgabe, Београд, 1877); (II. Ausgabe; Београд, 1889); (III. Ausgabe; Београд, 1904).

Popov, A. (Попов, Андрей) *Книга бытия небеси и земли* (*Палея историческая*) *с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881).

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877).

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]).

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996).

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]).

—, *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894).

2. *Collections of the Translations of Slavonic Pseudepigraphical Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература* (*IX–XVIII*) *въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922).

Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., К. Куев и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961).

Koneski, B. and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В .) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987).

Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.1–413.

Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992).

Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997).

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981).

Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Донка Петканова и Анисава Милтенова) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993).

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002).

Rubinkiewicz, R. (ed.) *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (Warszawa, 1999).

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) et al., *Страници од средновековната книжевност* (Скопје, 1978) 141–162.

3. *Bibliographies of the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*

Andersen, F.I. "Pseudepigrapha Studies in Bulgaria," *JSP* 1 (1987) 41–55.

—, *A Working Bibliography for Studies in the Enoch Traditions with Special Attention to the Book of the Secrets of Enoch (2 [Slavonic] Enoch)* (unpublished).

Bel'chikov, N.F. et al., (Бельчиков, Н.Ф., Бегунов, Ю.К., Рождественский, Н.П.) *Справочник-указатель печатных описаний славяно-русских рукописей* (Москва-Ленинград, 1963).

Bonwetsch, G.N. "Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen Handschriften," in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2. 886–917.

Charlesworth, J.H. *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCS, 75; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1981).

Charlesworth, J.H. with J.R. Mueller, *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series. Metuchen, NJ/London: American Theological Library Association and Scarecrow Press, 1987).

Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Diss. Vanderbilt, 1976) 87–91; 336–341.

Delling, G. *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965* (TU, Bd. 106, Berlin, 1969). (2. Aufl., Berlin, 1975).

Dmitrieva, R.P. (Дмитриева, Р.П.) *Библиография русского летописания* (Москва-Ленинград, 1962).

Droblenkova, N.F. (ed.) (Дробленкова Н.Ф.) *Библиография советских русских работ по литературе XI–XVII вв. за 1917–1957 гг.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1961) [repr. Leipzig, 1976].

—, *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1958–1967 гг.* (части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1978–1979).

—, *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1968–1972 гг.* (С.-Петербург, 1996).

D'jakov, V.A. ed., (Дьяков, В.А.) *Славяноведение в дореволюционной России: Биобиблиографический словарь* (Москва, 1979).

Guetcheva, K. (Гечева, Кръстина) *Богомилството. Библиография* (София, 1997).

Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998).

Ivanova, T.G. et al., (eds.) (Иванова, Т.Г.) *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР 1973–1987* (части 1, 2 и 3; С.-Петербург, 1996).

—, *Библиография работ по древнерусской литературе, опубликованных в СССР (России)* 1988–1992 (С.-Петербург, 1998).

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921).

Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158.

Lehnhardt, A. *Bibliographie zu den jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Gütersloh, 1999).

Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987).
—, *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989).
—, *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XVII в.*) (Части 1–4; С.-Петербург, 1992–1998).
Nazarevskij, A.A. (Назаревский, А.А.) *Библиография древнерусской повести* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *История русской литературы* (Том 1; С.-Петербург, 1902) 471–484.
Santos Otero, A. De. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen* (2 vols; PTS, 20 and 23; Berlin/New York, 1978 and 1981).
Stegmüller, F. *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950ff.).
Svodnyj, *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1984).
DiTommaso, L. *A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850–1999* (JSPSS, 39; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
Ubigli, R.L. "Gli apocrifi (o pseudepigrafi) dell'Antico Testamento. Bibliografia 1979–1989," *Henoch* 12 (1990) 259–321.
Walter, D.A. "Survey of Recent Research on the Albigensian Cathari," *CH* 34/5 (1965) 146–172.

4. *Pseudepigrapha*

Fragment "Seventy Names of God"

(Семьдесят Имен Богу)

a. *Texts*

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.339–344.

c. *Research*

Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) "Семьдесят имен Богу," Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.318–319.

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) "Книги отреченные," *Православная Богословская Энциклопедия* (12 томов; С.-Петербург, 1900–1911) 11.420.

Fragment "About All Creation"

(О Всей Твари)

a. *Texts*

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.347–350.

c. *Research*

Prohorov G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) "О всей твари," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.145–146.

Slavonic Life of Adam and Eve

a. *Texts*

Dimnik, M. *The Apocrypha of Adam and Eve in Russia: A Historical and Literary Analysis* (M.A. Thesis, Toronto, 1970) 186–190.

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Слово о Адаме," "Житие о Адаме и Еве и о согрешении их," *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов: Шевченка, 1896–1910) 1.19–23, 23–26.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) "Адам и Ева," *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 207–227.

Jagić, V. "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893) 1–104.

Novaković, S. *Примери књижевности и језика старога и српско-словенскога* (Београд, 1877) 418–423; (Београд, 1889) 419–424; (Београд, 1904) 489–495.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Слово о Адаме и Исповедание Евы," *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 34–46, 90–96, 208–216.

Pypin, A.N. *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862) 1–7.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 66–74.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.298–304.

b. *Translations*

Anderson, G.A., and Stone, M.E., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (EJL, 5; Atlanta, 1994 [1999]).

Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) "Слово за Адам и Ева," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 150–154.

Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "Слово об Адаме и Еве, от начала и до конца," *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (ed. В. Мильков; Москва, 1997) 148–153.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Об Адаме и Еве," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.100–107.

—, "Об Адаме и Еве," *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С-Петербург, 2002) 20–27.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "Слово за Адам и Ева от началото до свършека," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.35–41; 348–349.

c. *Research*

Anderson, G., Stone, M., Tromp, J. (ed.) *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (SVTP, 15; Leiden, 2000).

Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Димитринка) "Към въпроса за историята на текста на апокрифа Слово за Адам и Ева," *Старобългарска литература* 12 (1982) 70–81.

—, "Някои наблюдения върху литературните особенности на апокрифа 'Слово за Адам и Ева,'" *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 56–66.

—, "Космогоничната легенда за Тивериадского море и старобългарската апокрифна традиция," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 184–192.

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Критика і бібліографіа. XVII. Апокріф о Адамі," *Жите і Слово* 1 (1895) 478–479.
Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української лїтератури (На допомогу студентовї-заочнику)," *Українська мова ї лїтература в школї* 8 (1975) 27–33.
Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Адам и Ева," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 76–81.
Kagan M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) "Апокриф о Адаме и Еве," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.47–51.
Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Текстологически наблюдения върху два апокрифа (апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво, приписван на Григорий Богослов, и апокрифа за Адам и Ева)," *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 35–55.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 172–179.
Pypin, A. (Пыпин, А.) *История русской литературы* (4th ed.; С.-Петербург, 1911) 1.415–425, 427–429.
Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 30–36.
Sumcov, N.F. (Сумцов Н.Ф.) *Очерки истории южнославянских апокрифических сказаний и песен* (Киев, 1888) 32–37.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Н.С.) "Отреченные книги древней России," in: Тихонравов Н.С. *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; Москва, 1898) 152.
Turdeanu, É. "La Vie d'Adam et d'Ève en slave et en roumain," *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 75–144, 437–438.

The Story of God's Creation of Adam

(Сказание Как Сотворил Бог Адама)

a. *Texts*

Brodskij N.L. et al. (eds.) (Бродский, Н.Л.) *Историко-литературная хрестоматия. Ч. 2. Древняя русская письменность XI–XVII вв.* (Москва-Петроград, 1923) 43–44.
Dmitrieva, L.A., Lihachev, D.S. (Дмитриева, Л.А., Лихачев, Д.С.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XII век* (Ленинград, 1980) 148–153.
Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) "Апокрифическое Сказание о сотворении Адама в составе сборника середины XVII в. из Румянцевского собрания," *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ* 46 (1987) 76–81.
Gudzij, N.K., ed. (Гудзий Н.К.) *Хрестоматия по древней русской литературе XI–XVII вв.* (9th ed.; Москва, 1973) 91–92.
Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 421–427.

—, "Сказание о сотворении Богом Адама," in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов М.Н., Мильков В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 741–747.

Prokof'ev, N.I., ed. (Прокофьев, Н.И.) *Древняя русская литература*: *Хрестоматия* (Москва, 1980) 54–55.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 12–14.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.148–153.

—, "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.94–99.

Zhovtis, A.L., ed. (Жовтис, А.Л.) *Древнерусская литература. Хрестоматия* (Москва, 1966) 91–92.

b. *Translations*

Andersen, F.I. "On Reading Genesis 1–3," in: *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36 at 29–30.

Dmitrieva, L.A., Lihachev, D.S. (Дмитриева, Л.А., Лихачев, Д.С.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси. XII век* (Ленинград, 1980) 148–153.

Karpov, A. Ju. (Карпов, А. Ю.) "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: *Златоструй*: *Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 257–261.

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 428–431.

—, "Сказание о сотворении Богом Адама," in: Gromov, M.N., Mil'kov, V.V. (Громов М.Н., Мильков В.В.) *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 2001) 748–751.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.148–153.

—, "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.94–99.

Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Сказание о том, как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 202–205.

c. *Research*

Andersen, F.I. "On Reading Genesis 1–3," in: *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36.
—, "On Reading Genesis 1–3," in: *Backgrounds for the Bible* (eds. M.P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind., 1987) 137–150.
Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изостреви борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 87–88.
Gromov, M.N. (Громов М.Н.) "Античное учение о стихиях в Древней Руси," *Вестник МГУ* (*Философия*) 7.2 (1981) 65–74.
—, "К истолкованию апокрифа о сотворении Адама," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 42 (1989) 256–261.
Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий Н.К.) *История древнерусской литературы* (Москва, 1938) 42–43.
Kuskov, V.V. (Кусков, В.В.) *История древнерусской литературы* (3 изд.; Москва, 1977) 38.
Kuzmin, A.G. (Кузьмин А.Г.) "Апокрифическое сказание об Адаме," *Златоструй*: *Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1990) 256–257.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 97–98.
Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин А.Н.) "Легенды и апокрифы в древней русской письменности," *Вестник Европы* 3 (1894) 304–305.
—, *История Русской Литературы* (С.-Петербург, 1902) 1.425–426.
Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Сказание как сотворил Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.649–650.
Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.
Vostokov, A. (Востоков, А.) *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского музея* (С.-Петербург, 1842) 546.

Adam Octipartite

(От Скольких Частей Сотворил Бог Адама)

a. *Texts*

Jagić, V. (Ягич Ватрослав) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868) 41–44.
Gupalo, Ju. M. (Гупало, Ю.М.) "Три фрагмента о сотворении человека," *Повести Древней Руси* (Москва, 2002) 369–371.
Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "От Колика Части Сотвори Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.92.
Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 442–443, 445.

b. *Translations*

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "От Колика Части Сотвори Бог Адама," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.93.

—, "О сотворении Адама," *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С-Петербург, 2002) 19–20.

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 444, 446.

c. *Research*

Böttrich, C. *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (JU, 59; Frankfurt am Main, 1995).

Förster, M. "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung: Ein lateinisches Fragment des s.g. slawischen Henoch," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1907–1908) 477–529.

Jagić, V. "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna, 1893) 44–47.

Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) "От коих частей создан бысть Адам," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.153–155.

Kagan, M.D. et al., (Каган, М.Д., Понырко, Н.В., Рождественская, М.В.) "Описание сборников XV в. книгописца Ефросина," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 172–196.

Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]) 119–120.

Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.

Turdeanu, É. "Dieu créa l'homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde," *Revue des études roumaines* 13–14 (1974) 163–194.

—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 404–435.

Adamic Fragments in the Apocryphal Circle about the Tree of the Cross

(Слово о Крестном Древе)

a. *Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература* (*IX–XVIII*) *въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София: Паскалев, 1922) 249–254.

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 2.242–245.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург 1906) 109–110.

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868) 28–35.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Слово о Крестном Древе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.284–290.

Polivka, G. "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu," *Starine* 21 (1889) 216–218.

Popov, A. (Попов, А.) *Первое прибавление к описанию рукописей и каталогу книг церковной печати библиотеки А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1875) 31–44.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 47–50, 96–99, 101–103.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 81–82.

Stojanović L. (Стојановић, Љ.) "Неколико рукописа из царске библиотеке у Бечу. 1. Један апокрифни зборник XVII столећа," *Гласник* 63 (1885) 53–59.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Слово о древе крестном," in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.305–313.

b. *Translations*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 249–254.

Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) "Апокриф за кръстното дърво," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 171–173.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Слово о Крестном Древе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.285–291.

—, "Слово о Крестном Древе," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 121–128.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.274–288.

Zachinjaev, A. (Зачиняев, А.) *Апокрифы. Духовные Стихи. Легенды* (С.-Петербург, 1909) 6–10.

c. *Research*

Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1. С-Петербург, 1861) 489.

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *История сербо-хорватской литературы* (Казань, 1872) 100–102, 106–109.

Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) "Апокрифы о крестном древе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.60–66.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Слово о Крестном Древе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.402–406.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Текстологически наблюдения върху два апокрифа (апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво, приписван на Григорий Богослов, и апокрифа за Адам и Ева)," *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982) 35–55.

—, "Апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво," in: *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 30–31.

—, "Апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво," in: *Старобългарска Литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 39–40.

Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский В. Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Варшава, 1887) 157–165.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 105–115, 132, 138–141, 165–166.

—, *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 47–52.

Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов Матвей Иванович) *Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск 1. Компиляция апокрифов болгарского попа Иеремии* (Москва, 1888) 72–211.

Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский А.Н.) "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. 10. Западные легенды о древе креста и Слово Григория о трёх крестных древах," *Записки Императорской Академии Наук* 45.1 (1883) 365–417.

Adamic Fragments in the Discourse of the Three Hierarchs

(Беседа Трёх Святителей)

a. *Texts*

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868) 40–44.

Karpov, A. (Карпов, А.) *Азбуковники или алфавиты иностранных речей* (*По спискам Соловецкой библиотеки*) (Казань, 1874) 124–132.

Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) "Беседа трех святителей," in: Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (*XI–XVII вв.*) (Москва, 1989) 69–74.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о новозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (С.-Петербург, 1890) 378–396.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 168–178.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Из беседы трех святителей," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.350–358.

Suschickij, F.P. (Сушицкий, Ф.П.) *Киевские списки "Беседы трех святителей" (Из филологического семинара В.П. Перетца)* (Киев, 1911).

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 433–438.

Vjazemskij, P.P. (Вяземский, П.П.) "Беседа трех святителей," *Памятники древней письменности* 1 (1880) 63–123.

b. *Translations*

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.331–334.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Беседа трёх святителей," in: *Златоструй*: *Древняя Русь X–XIII вв*. (ed. А.Г. Кузьмин; Москва, 1990) 266–275.

—, "Из беседы трех святителей," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.351–359.

—, "Из беседы трех святителей," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 142–148.

Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Беседа трёх святителей," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 169–176.

c. *Research*

Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А. Я.) "К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе," *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.

Buchilina, E.A. (Бучилина, Е.А.) *Апокриф "Беседа трех святителей" как памятник средневековой русской литературы* (Москва, 1994).

Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев, Ф.И.) *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 2. С-Петербург, 1861) 15–31.

Krasnosel'skij, N.F. (Красносельский, Н.Ф.) *К вопросу о греческих источниках "Беседы трех святителей"* (Записки Новороссийского университета, 55; Одесса, 1890).

Lur'e, Ja. S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Беседа трех святителей," Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.89–93.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "'Беседа на тримата светители' в южнославянската ръкописна традиция. Бележки върху класификацията на преписите," *Възрожденският текст. Прочити на литературата и културата на българското Възраждане. В чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Дочо Леков* (София, 1998) 336–344.

—, "Към въпроса гръцките прототипи на т. нар. 'Беседа на тримата светители,'" ΠΟΛΥΧΡΟΝΙΑ. *Сборник в чест на проф. Иван Божилов* (София, 2002) 212–229.

Mil'kov, V.V., Smol'nikova L.N. (Мильков В.В., Смольникова Л.Н.) "Апокрифическая "Беседа трех святителей" в Древней Руси и ее идейно-мировоззренческое содержание," *Общественная мысль: исследования и публикации* (Вып. III; Москва, 1993) 153–164.

Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский В. Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Варшава, 1887) 24–53.

—, *Следы народной Библии в славянской и древнерусской письменности* (Одесса, 1893) 1–172.

—, *Греческие списки так называемой "Беседы трех святителей"* (Варшава, 1901).

Nachtigall, R., "Ein Beitrag zu den Forschungen über die sogenannte 'Беседа трех святителей' (Gespräch dreier Heiligen)," *Archiv für Slavische Philologie* 23 (1901) 1–95; 24 (1902) 321–408; 26 (1904) 472–477.

Pypin, A. (Пыпин, А.) "Исследование для объяснения статьи о ложных книгах," *Летописи Занятий Археографической комиссии* (*1861*). (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1862) 41, 49.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Из беседы трех святителей," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.410–411.

Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Беседа трёх святителей," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 176–185.

Zhdanov, I.N. (Жданов, И.Н.) "Беседа трех святителей и Ioca monachorum," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 1 (1892) 157–194.

The Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus

(Слово Адама во Аде к Лазарю)

a. *Texts*

Hitchcock, D.R. *The Appeal of Adam to Lazarus in Hell* (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 302; The Hague, 1979).

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев И. Я.) in: *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности* 52 (1891) 230–231.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые

Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 11–12.

b. *Translations*

[Anonymous], "The Homily of Adam in Hades to Lazarus," *Slavonic and East European Review* 10 (1931) 244–252.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) "В пятницу цветной недели слово святых апостолов от Адама в аду к Лазарю," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 103–105.

c. *Research*

Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) 29.

Sataniel Text (Tentatio Adae et Evae a Satanael)

a. *Texts*

Gaylord, H.E. "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.

b. *Translations*

Gaylord, H.E. "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.

c. *Research*

Gaylord, H.E. "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.

Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) 29.

Stichel, R. "Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse," in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (eds. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 177; Göttingen, 1989) 116–128.

Stone, M. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Early Judaism and Its Literature, 3; Atlanta, 1992) 116.

Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 17–31.

Adamic and Sataniel Fragments in the Legend about the Tiberian Sea

(Легенда о Тивериадском Море)

a. *Texts*

Barsov, E. (Барсов, Е.) "О Тивериадском море по списку XVI века," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1886) 5–8.

b. *Translations*

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 290–294; 303–311.

Jagić, V. "Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, I, Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Classe* 42 (Vienna 1893) 44–47.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "За Тивериадското море," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 31–35.

c. *Research*

Beljaev, M.V. (Беляев М.В.) "Происхождение народных легенд о миротворении," *Изв. Азербайдж. ун-та. Сер. обществ. Наук* 4/5 (1925) 70.

Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Димитринка) "Космогоничната легенда за Тивериадского море и старобългарската апокрифна традиция," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 184–192.

Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа* (Скопје, 1978) 33–34.

Markov, A. (Марков А.) "Море Тивериадское в дуалистической легенде о сотворении мира," *Этнографическое Обозрение* 1/2 (кн. 96/97) (М., 1913) 64–75.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872).

The Apocryphon about the Struggle of the Archangel Michael with Sataniel

(Апокриф о Борьбе Архангела Михаила с Сатанаилом)

a. *Texts*

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Апокрифът за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции," *Старобългарска литература* 9 (1981) 98–113.

—, "Неизвестна редакция на апокрифа за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил," in: *Литературознание и фолклористика. Сборник в чест на акад. Петър Динеков* (София, 1983) 121–127.

b. *Translations*

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 18–25.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Слово на Йоан Златоуст за това как Михаил победи Сатанаил," in: Bozhilov, I., et al., eds., (Божилов, И. и Кожухаров С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 150–156.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "Слово за лъжливия Антихрист, без-

божен Сатанаил, как го плени Архангел Михаил," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 41–48; 349–350.

c. *Research*

Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) "Темата на произхода на злото в старобългарската апокрифна традиция," in: *Литература, общество, идеи* (София, 1986) 25–47.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Апокрифът за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции," *Старобългарска литература* 9 (1981) 98–113.

—, "Неизвестна редакция на апокрифа за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил," in: *Литературознание и фолклористика. Сборник в чест на акад. Петър Динеков* (София, 1983) 121–127.

2 Enoch

a. *Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София: Паскалев, 1922) 185–194.

Arheograficheskaja Komissja (Археографическая Комиссия), *Великие Минеи Четии собранные Всероссийским Митрополитом Макарием. Декабрь дни 25–31* (Москва, 1912) 2496–2499.

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов: Шевченка, 1896–1910) 1.39–64.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) "Енох," J. Ivanov, *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 165–191.

Ivšić, St. "Hrvatski glagoljski apokrif o Melhisedekovu rodjenju i spasenju za općega potopa," *Nastavni vjesnik* 39 (1930–1931) 101–108.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Сказание о Мелхиседеке," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.114–119.

Kazakova, N.A. and Lur'e, Ja. S. (Казакова Н.А. и Лурье Я.С.) *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955) 215–220, 309–312, 388–391.

Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Книга Еноха," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.204–240.

Novaković, S. "Apokrif o Enohu," *Starine* XVI (1884) 67–81.

Popov, A. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Москва, 1896 [repr. Onasbrück, 1986) 154–169.

—, "Южнорусский сборник 1679 года," *Библиографические материалы* (*Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских*, 3.9; Москва, 1880) 66–139.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 15–16.

Schneider, R., *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes, 23; Freiburg, 1986).

Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов Матвей Иванович) "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899) 1–112.

—, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910) 1–167.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 75–80.

Tihomirov, M. (Тихомиров, М.) *Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века* (Москва, 1961).

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.19–23, 26–31.

Vaillant, A. *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4; Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1976 [1952]).

b. *Translations*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София, 1922) 185–194.

Agourides, S.C. "Enoch B' e To Biblio ton Mystikon tou Enoch (Slavonikos Enoch)," in S. Agourides (ed.), *Ta Apokrypha tes Palaias Diathekes B'* (Athens, 1984) 443–476.

—, "Enoch B' e To Biblio ton Mystikon tou Enoch (Slavonikos Enoch)," *Theo* 56 (1985) 127–160.

Andersen, F.I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.91–221.

Averincev, S.S. (Аверинцев Сергей Сергеевич) *От берегов Босфора до берегов Евфрата* (Москва, 1987).

—, "Книга Еноха Праведного. Славянский Енох," *Книга Еноха. Тайны Земли и Неба* (ed. И. Лосиевский; Москва, 2003) 250–281.

Barnstone, W. *The Other Bible: Jewish Pseudepigrapha, Christian Apocrypha, Gnostic Scriptures, Kabbalah, Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco, 1984) 3–9, 495–500.

Bonsirven, J. "Les livres des secrets d'Hénoch," in: *La Bible apocryphe en marge de l'Ancien Testament*. Textes choisis et traduits par J. Bonsirven (Paris, [1953] 1975) 227–247.

Bonwetsch, G.N. *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG.PH Neue Folge Bd.1 Nr.3; Berlin, 1896).
—, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922).
Böttrich, C. *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ Band V Lieferung 7; Gütersloh, 1995).
Bugge, A. 'Anden Enoksbog', in E. Hammershaimb et al. (eds.), *De Gammeltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer* (Kopenhagen, 1974) 2.791–826.
Charles, R.H., W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford, 1896).
Charles, R.H., N. Forbes. "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; ed. R.H. Charles; Oxford, 1913) 2. 425–469.
Cousin, H. *Vies d'Adam et Eve, des patriarches et des prophètes. Textes juifs autour de l'ère chrétienne* (CahÉvSup, 32; Paris, 1988) 35–40.
Deißmann, A. "2 Enoch" in: *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1900[1922]) 149–177.
Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) "Апокрифът за праведния Енох," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 162–168.
Enrietti, M. "Libro dei segreti di Enoc," in: *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (ed. P. Sacchi; Turin, 1989) 2.477ff.
Ginzberg, L. "The Ascension of Enoch," *The Legends of the Jews* (6 vols.; Philadelphia, 1909 and 1925) 1.130–137 (text); 5.158–162.
Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "Книга Еноха," *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (ed. В. Мильков; Москва, 1997) 47–54.
—, "Книга Святых тайн Еноха. Славянский Енох," *Книга Еноха. Тайны Земли и Неба* (ed. И. Лосиевский; Москва, 2003) 282–316.
Jack, A. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Albuquerque, 1972).
Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Сказание о Мелхиседеке," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.114–119.
Kagan-Tarkovskij, R.B. (Каган-Тарковский, Р.Б.) "Сказание о Мелхиседеке," *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (ed. М.В. Рождественская; С-Петербург, 2002) 33–37.
Kahana, A., "Sefer Hanok B," in: *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah* (2 vols.; Tel-Aviv, 1937 [Ramat Gan, 1959]) 1.102–141.
Karpov, A. Ju. (Карпов, А. Ю.) "Из потаённых книг Еноха Праведного," in: *Златоструй*: *Древняя Русь X–XIII вв*. (ed. A.G. Kuz'min; Москва, 1990) 266–275.
Kuev, K. "Апокрифът за праведния Енох," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (eds. П. Динеков, *et al.*; София, 1978) 162–168.
Moriyasu, T. "2 (Slavonic) Enoch," in: *Seisho Gaiten Giten* (eds. M. Sekine and S. Arai; Tokio, 1975) 3.206–251 and 363–378.
Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Книга Еноха," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.204–241.
Pennington, A. "2 Enoch," in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 321–362.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "Книга за светите тайни Енохови," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 49–63.
—, "Из 'Книга за светите тайни Енохови,'" in: Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Донка Петканова и Анисава Милтенова) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 7–10.
Pincherle, M., "Il secondo libro di Enoch ("Enoch Slavo" o "Enoch II")," in Pincherle, *Il libro di Enoch* (Scienza e Ignoto,9; Faenza, 1977) 12–13, 223–278.
Rießler, P. "Henochbuch (slavisch) oder Zweiter Henoch," in: *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg, 1928; repr. Heidelberg, 1966, 1984).
Rubinkiewicz, R. "Księga Henocha słowiańska," *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (ed. R. Rubinkiewicz; Warszawa, 1999) 207–222.
Sacchi, P. "Libro dei segreti di Enoc," *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; Ed. P. Sacchi, et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 2.479–594.
Santos Otero, A. De. "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," in: *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (5 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid, 1984–1987) 4.147–202.
Schneider, R. *Die moralisch-belehrenden Artikel im altrussischen Sammelband Merilo Pravednoe* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris. Fontes et Dissertationes 23; Freiburg/ i. Br., 1986) 93–99.
Sokolov, M.I. "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом," *ЧОИДР* 4 (1899) 1–80.
Székely, St. "Liber Henoch Slavicus," in: *Bibliotheca Apocrypha. Introductio Historico-Critica in Libros Apocryphos utriusque testamenti cum Explicatione Argumenti et Doctrinae* (Freiburg, 1913) 1.227–242.
Vaillant, A. *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris, [1952] 1976).
Vaillant A. and M. Philonenko, "Livre des secrets d'Hénoch," in: *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (eds. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; La Pléade; Paris, 1987) 1187–1223.
Zvezda Volhvov (Звезда Волхвов) "Книга Еноха," *Поэтические гностические тексты христианства* (Новочеркасск, 1994) 19–24.

c. *Research*

Aalen, S. *Heilsverlangen und Heilsverwirklichung. Studien zur Erwartung des Heils in der apokalyptischen Literatur des antiken Judentums und im ältesten Christentum* (ALGHJ, 21; Leiden, 1990) 49–50.
Alexander, P. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 173–180 at 160–161.
—, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.223–315 at 247–248.
—, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, 1998) 102–111.
Alon, G. "Par'irtin. On the History of the High Priesthood at the End of the Second Temple Period," *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World. Studies in Jewish*

History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud (Tr. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem, 1977) 48–88.
Alonso Días, J. "Sentido del 'juicio final' de Yahvé en la apocalíptica y en Mt 25," *Studium ovetense* 5 (1977) 77–98.
Amusin, I.D. (Амусин Иосиф Давидович) "'Избранник Бога' в кумранских текстах," *Вестник Древней Истории* 1 (1966) 73–79.
—, *Кумранская Община* (Москва, 1983).
—, "Новый эсхатологический текст из Кумрана (11Q Melchisedek)," *Вестник Древней Истории* 3 (1967) 45–62.
—, *Тексты Кумрана* (Вып.1; Памятники письменности Востока, 33/1; Москва, 1971).
Andersen, F.I. "On Reading Genesis 1–3," *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11–36.
—, "The Second Book of Enoch," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; Garden City, N.Y., 1992) 2.516–522.
Anderson, G.A. "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105–134. ["The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP 15; Leiden, 2000) 83–110].
Aptowitzer, V. "Les éléments juifs dans la légende du Golgotha," *Revue des études juives* 79 (1924) 145–162.
—, "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93–113.
Arsenij, Ieromonah (Арсений, Иеромонах) "Описание славянских рукописей библиотеки Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры (I–III; Москва, 1878–1879)," in: *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1878) and *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2 (1879).
Bamberger, B.J. *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia, 1952) 32–35, 289–290.
Barth, C. *Diesseits und Jenseits im Glauben des späten Israel* (SBS, 72; Stuttgart, 1974) 37–39.
Bauckham, R. "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," *JTS* 41 (1990) 355–385.
—, *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (SNT, 93; Leiden, 1998).
—, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; SJSJ, 63; Leiden, 1999) 43–69.
Baudry, G.-H. "Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 49 (1992) 163–192.
Bauer, J.B. *Clavis apocryphorum supplementum. Complectens voces versionis germanicae libri Henoch slavici, libri Jubilaeorum, Odarum Solomonis* (GTS, 4; Graz, 1980) 121–170.
Bietenhard, H. "Excurs: Die Schöpfungserzählung von 2 Hen 24–33," *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT, 2; Tübingen, 1951) 95–100.
Böklen, E. *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1902).
Böttrich, C. *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch.*

Dissertation zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades Dr. theol (Kirchliche Hochschule, Leipzig, 1990).
—, "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JSP* 9 (1991) 35–42.
—, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen, 1992). [review in *TLZ* 116 (1991) 772–773].
—, "Das 'Sanctus' in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* (1994–1995) 10–36.
—, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (JU, 59 Frankfurt am Main, 1995).
—, *"Die Vögel des Himmels haben ihn begraben." Überlieferungen zu Abels Bestattung und zur Ätiologie des Grabes* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 3; Göttingen, 1995).
—, "Beobachtungen zum Midrasch vom 'Leben Henochs,'" *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83.
—, "Astrologie in der Henochtradition," *ZAW* 109 (1997) 222–245.
—, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JJS* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.
—, "Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen im slavischen Henochbuch und in Qumran," in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. von C. Hempel, A. Lange und H. Lichtenberger; BEThL, 159; Leuven 2002) 297–321.
Bousset, W. "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," *ARW* 4 (1901) 136–169.
—, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen, 3rd ed., repr. 1966 [1903]).
Bow, B.A. "Melchizedek's Birth Narrative in 2 Enoch 68–73: Christian Correlations," *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity. G.W.E. Nickelsburg Festschrift* (ed. R.A. Argall, et al.; Harrisburg, 2000) 33–41.
Brandenburger, E. *Adam und Christus. Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5, 12–21 (1. Kor. 15)* (WMANT, 7; Neukirchen–Vluyn, 1962) 41–42.
Burkitt, F.C. *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London, 1914) 75–76.
Camponovo, O. *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (OBO, 58; Freiburg, 1984).
Caquot, A., "La pérennité du sacerdoce," in: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris, 1978) 109–116.
Cavallin, H.C. "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.19.1 (Berlin/New York, 1979) 240–345.
Cerbelaud, D. "Le nom d'Adam et les points cardinaux. Recherches sur un theme patristique," *VC* 38 (1984) 285–301.
Cerutti, M.V. "Protologia e femminino in 1 Enoc, 2 Enoc, Apocalisse di Mosè, Vita di Adamo ed Eva," *RSB* 6 (1994) 119–139.
Charles, R.H. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity; or Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Times till the Close of the New Testament Canon. Being the Jewett Lectures for 1898–1899* (London, 1899) 261–266.

—, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–163.
—, *Eschatology. The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity. a Critical History* (New York, 1963) 315–320.
Charlesworth, J.H. "Jewish Astrology in the Talmud, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Palestinian Synagogues," *HTR* 70 (1977) 183–200.
—, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch," *NTS* 25 (1978–1979) 315–323.
—, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. J.J. Collins et al.; SCS, 12; Chico, 1980) 135–151.
—, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCS, 75; Atlanta, 1981).
—, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (MSSNTS, 54; Cambridge, 1985).
Charlesworth, J.H. with J.R. Mueller. *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series. Metuchen, NJ/London, 1987).
Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 336–341.
Collins, J.J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, 1998) 243–247.
—, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen, 1983) 531–548.
—, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, et al.; HOS, 1.49; Leiden, 2000) 119–139.
Cortès, E. *Los discursos de adiós de Gn 49 a Jn 13–17. Pistas para la historia de un género literario en la antigua literature judía* (Barselona, 1976) 146–151.
Culianu, I.P. "Les anges des peuples et la question des origines du dualisme gnostique," *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique. Actes du Colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (11–14 mars 1980)* (ed. J. Ries, et al.; PIOL, 27; Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982) 130–145.
Daniélou, J. "Terre et paradis chez les pères de l'église," *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 22 (1953) 433–472.
—, "Trinité et angélologie dans la théologie judéo-chrétienne," *RSR* 45 (1957) 5–41.
—, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago, 1964). [*Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme. Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée* (Paris, 1958)]
Danilova, V.M. (Данилова, В.М.) *Палеографическое и фонетическое описание рукописи Мерило Праведное (Троицкое собрание, № 15)* (Москва, 1969).
Davila, J. "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 248–274.
De Conick, A. "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A

Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup 63; Leiden, 1999) 325–330 at 314.
Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (JudUm, 8; Frankfurt am Main/New York, 1984) 225–238, 256–258.
Delcor, M. "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 126–130.
—, "Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive. Histoire et traditions," *RHR* 189 (1976) 3–53.
—, "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave," *Kecharitomene. Mélanges René Laurentin* (ed. C. Augustin et al.; Paris, 1990) 217–229.
Dennefeld, L. *Le messianisme* (Paris, 1929) 213–214.
Díez Merino, L. "Los 'vigilantes' en la literatura intertestamentaria," *Simposio biblico español (Salamanca, 1982)* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos et al.; Madrid, 1984) 575–609.
Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа* (Скопје, 1978) 37–38.
Dumke, J.A. *The Suffering of the Righteous in Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Diss. Duke, 1980) 154–157.
Efron, J. "Holy War and Visions of Redemption in the Hasmonean Period," *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (ed. J. Neusner; SJLA, 39; Leiden, 1987) 33–65.
Eiß, W. "Der Kalender des nachexilischen Judentums (mit Ausnahme des essenischen Kalenders)," *Die Welt des Orients* 3 (1964) 44–47.
Evans, J.M. "Microcosmic Adam," *Medium Aevum* 35 (1966) 38–42.
Färber, P. *Wesen, Aufgabe und Hierarchie der Engel in den drei Henochbüchern* (Diss.; Graz, 1983/84) 1–33.
Fischer, U. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin, 1978) 37–70.
Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2/94; Tübingen, 1997) 140–141.
—, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden, 2002).
Förster, M. "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des s. g. slavischen Henoch," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1908) 477–529.
Forsyth, N. *The Old Enemy. Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, 1987) 221–247.
Fortheringham, J.K. "The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 20 (1919) 252.
—, "The Easter Calendar of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 23 (1922) 49–56.
Fossum, J. "Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201.
—, "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism," *VC* 37 (1983) 260–287.
—, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Göttingen, 1995).
—, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985).

Frey, J.-B. "Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament. 15. Le livre d'Hénoch slave ou livre des secrets d'Hénoch," *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément* (ed. L. Pirot et al.; Paris, 1928) cols 353–460 at 448–454.
García Santos, Á. "El pecado de los ángeles: los vigilantes," *Estudios Biblicos* 51 (1993) 41–72.
Gieschen, C. "The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in *2 Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Early Christian Interpretation of Scriptures of Israel* (eds. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; JSNTSup., 148; Sheffield, 1997) 364–379.
—, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU 42; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998) 158.
Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia, 1909 and 1925) 5.161–163
Golitzin, A. "The Place of the Presence of God: Aphrahat of Persia's Portrait of the Christian Holy Man," in: *Essays in Honor of Archimandrite Aimilianos of the Monastery of Simonos Petras* (Athens: Indiktos, 2003) 391–447.
Gorskij, A.V. and K.J. Nevostruev, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной Библиотеки* (Москва, 1859).
Gowan, D.E. "The Fall and Redemption of the Material World in Apocalyptic Literature," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 7 (1995) 83–103.
Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української лїтератури (На допомогу студентовї-заочнику)," *Українська мова ї лїтература в школї* 8 (1975) 27–33.
Gruenwald, Ithamar, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden, 1980) 50–51.
Gry, L. "La création en sept jours d'après les apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 2 (1908) 277–293.
—, "Séjours et habitats divins d'après les apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 4 (1910) 694–722.
—, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203.
Haag, H. "Die Dämonenlehre der Pseudepigraphen," *Teufelsglaube* (Tübingen, 1974) 218–246.
Hahne, H.A. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation. An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:19–22 in Light of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Diss. Wycliffe College, 1997) 214–233.
Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 38–40.
Harnack, A. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1896 [Leipzig, 1958]).
Hilhorst, A. "A Visit to Paradise: Apocalypse of Paul 45 and Its Background," *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 2; Leiden, 1999) 128–139.
Himmelfarb, M. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford, 1993) 37–44, 83–87.
Hughes, H.M. *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Diss. London, 1909).
Idel, M. "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Хронограф Академии Наук No. 45.13.4.," *Лето-*

писи историко-филологического общества при Новороссийском университете (XIII; Одесса, 1905) 313–341.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 81–88.

—, "Описание южно-славянских и русских рукописей заграничных библиотек," *Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности* 98 (1921) 225–229.

Jerome, F.J. *Das geschichtliche Melchisedech-Bild und seine Bedeutung im Hebräerbriefe* (Freiburg i.Br., 1920) 10–12.

Kähler, C. *Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte der biblischen Makarismen* (Diss. Jena, 1974) 141–148.

Kalachov, N.V. (Калачов, Н.В.) "Мерило Праведное," *Архив историко-юридических сведений, относящихся до России, изд. Николаем Калачёвым* (I(III); Москва, 1850) 28–40.

Kallander, D.C. *The Defense of Jerusalem in the Roman Siege of 70 C.E.: A Study of First Century Apocalyptic Ideas* (Diss. Miami, 1980) 39–40.

Kamlah, E. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT, 7; Tübingen, 1964).

Klausner, J. "The Psalms of Solomon," *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (tr. W.F. Stinespring; New York, 1955).

Kohler, K. *Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion, with Special Reference to Dante's Comedy* (New York, 1923) 67–70.

Kreitzer, L.J. *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* (JSNTSup, 19: Sheffield, 1987) 41–46, 51–52.

Kuck, D.W. *Judgment and Community Conflict. Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (NovTSup, 66; Leiden, 1992) 89–93.

Küchler, M. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* (OBO, 26; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1979) 62–87.

Kutsch, E. *Das Herbstfest in Israel* (Diss. Mainz, 1955) 51–52.

Lake, K. "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398.

Leonid, Arhimandrit (Kavelin). [Леонид, Архимандрит (Кавелин)] *Систематическое описание славяно-российских рукописей собрания Графа А.С. Уварова (со включением 750 ном. Собрания И.Н. Карского, описанных П.М. Строевым в алфавитном порядке)* (I–IV; Москва, 1893–1894).

—, "Сведение о славянских рукописях, поступивших из книгохранилища Св. Троицкой Сергиевой Лавры в библиотеки Троицкой Духовной Семинарии в 1747 (ныне находящихся в библиотеке Московской Духовной Академии)," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1884) 267–278.

Levin, A.G. *The Tree of Life: Genesis 2:9/3:22–24 in Jewish, Gnostic and Early Christian Texts* (Diss. Harvard, 1996).

Littman, E. "Enoch, Books of: II Slavonic Enoch," *The Jewish Encyclopedia* 5.181–182.

Ljubimov, V.P. (Любимов, В.П.) *Правда Русская* (Москва-Ленинград, 1940) 89–103.

Loisy, A., "Un nouveau livre d'Hénoch," *RHLR* 1 (1896) 29–57.

Lowther Clarke, W.K. "St. Luke and the Pseudepigrapha: Two Parallels," *JTS* 15 (1913–1914) 597–599.
Lukyn Williams, A. "The Cult of the Angels at Colossae," *JTS* 10 (1909) 413–438.
Lupieri, E. "Apocalisse di Giovanni e tradizione enochica," *In Apocalittica e Origini Cristiane* (RSB, 7; Bologna, 1995) 137–150.
McKenna, M.M. *"The Two Ways" in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period. A Study of the Form of Repentance Paranesis* (Diss. Pensylvannia, 1981) 205–226, 246–252.
Mach, M. "From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism?" *EncApoc* 229–264 at 251.
Makushev, V. (Макушев В.) "О некоторых рукописях народной библиотеки в Белграде. I: Рукописи болгарского письма," *Русский Филологический Вестник* 6 (1881) 309–324.
Maunder, A.S.D. "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316.
De Merode, M. "'Une aide qui lui corresponde,' L'exégèse de Gen. 2, 18–24 dans les écrits de l'Ancien Testament, du judaïsme et du Nouveau Testament," *Revue de théologie de Louvain* 8 (1977) 329–355.
Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский Никита Александрович) "Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 130–147.
—, "К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе)," *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964) 91–108.
—, "Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–206.
—, "К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха," *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78.
—, "К вопросу о составе и источниках Академического Хронографа," *Летописи и хроники. Сборник статей* (Москва, 1973) 212–219.
—, "Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы," *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976) 181–210.
Milik, J.T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976) 107–124.
Muños León, D. *Palabra y Gloria. Excursus en la Biblia y en la literatura intertestamentaria* (Madrid, 1983) 197–199.
Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000).
—, "'Одеания ею пению раздаанию' в славянском переводе книги Еноха," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003) 3–11.
Nestle, E. "Eph. v. 14 and the Secrets of Enoch," *The Expository Times* 9 (1897–1898) 376–377.
Newman, C.C. *Paul's Glory-Christology. Tradition and Rhetoric* (NovTSup, 69; Leiden, 1992) 85, 90–91.

Nickelsburg, G. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia, 1981).
—, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, 1972).
Niebuhr, K.W. *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT, 2.28; Tübingen, 1987) 185–194.
Nikolov, E. (Николов, Е.) *Апокрифна литература* (София, 1948) 17–20.
Nordheim, E. von. *Die Lehre der Alten. I. Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (ALGHJ, 13; Leiden, 1980) 221–225.
Odeberg, H. *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York, 1973) 52–63.
Oegema, G.S. *Für Israel und die Völker. Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie* (NovTSup, 95; Leiden, 1999) 181–182.
Orlov, A.A. "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 71–86.
—, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38.
—, "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.
—, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000) 19–26.
—, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.
—, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Seminar Papers 39, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2000* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) 130–147.
—, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303.
—, "Noach's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.
—, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76.
—, "Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and Merkabah Tradition," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14.1 (2004) 3–29.
—, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ, 107; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2005).
Orton, D.E. *The Understanding Scribe. Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup, 25; Sheffield, 1989) 95–97.
Otto, R. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. A Study in the History of Religion* (tr. F.V. Wilson and B.L. Woolf; London, 1938). [*Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch* (München, 1934)]
Otzen, B. "Himmelrejser og Himmelvisioner i jødisk Apokalyptic," *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 58 (1995) 16–28.
—, "The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (ed. P. Bilde et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154.
Palmer, D.W. "Origin, Form, and Purpose of Mark 16:4 in Codex Bobbiensis," *JTS* 27 (1976) 113–122.

Patella, M. *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel. Luke 23,44–49* (CahRB, 43; Paris, 1999) 143–144.
Pearson, B.A. "Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, PA, 1998) 176–202.
Penna, R. *L'ambiente storico-culturale delle origini cristiane. Una documentazione ragionata* (BNS, 7; Bologna, 1984) 89–91.
Philonenko, M. "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in: *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109–116.
Picard, J.-C. "Trajets du corps, trajets célestes: éléments d'une cosmologie juive," *Moïse Géographe. Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (Ed. A Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; ÉPP, 24; Paris, 1988) 31–49.
Pines, S. "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," *EJ* 6.797–799.
—, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption* (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky et al.; NumenSup, 18; Leiden, 1970).
Piper, J. *"Love Your Enemies." Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis. A History of the Tradition and Interpretation of Its Uses* (SNTSMS, 38; Cambridge, 1979) 36–37.
Poljakov, F. "Beiträge zur Edition des 'Merilo Pravednoe,' *Die Welt der Slaven* 32.2 (1987) 313–333.
Popov, A. (Попов, А.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Москва, 1869).
—, "Библиографические материалы," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1880) 66–139.
Porter, F.C. "The yeçer hara. A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin," *Biblical and Semitic Studies. Critical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University* (New York/London, 1901) 91–156 at 154–156.
Potter, C.F. *Did Jesus Write This Book?* (New York, 1965).
Puech, É. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle?* (2 vols.; Ébib, 21–22; Paris, 1993) 1.176–182.
Quelle, C. "El 'más allá.' Visión de la apocalíptica judía," *Biblia y fe* 55 (1993) 51–70 at 66–68.
Raphael, S.P. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife* (Northvale, NJ, 1994) 94–96, 106–107.
Rau, E. *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und die Lehrautorität Henochs. Traditions- und formgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum äth. Henochbuch und zu verwandten Schriften* (Diss. Hamburg, 1970) 203–209.
Reeves, J. "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Reeves; Atlanta, 1994) 173–203.
Reichelt, G. *Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln in der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Diss. Göttingen, 1975).
Repp, F. "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des cod. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek," *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 58–68.
Rohland, J.P. *Der Erzengel Michael. Arzt und Feldherr: Zwei Aspekte des vor- und frühbyzantinischen Michaelskultes* (BZRGG, 19; Leiden, 1977) 55–57.

Romano, D. "Enok, Libro eslavo de," *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* (6 vols.; ed. J.A. Gutiérrez-Larraya; Barselona, 1963) 3.36.

Rosenkranz, S. "Vom Pardies zum Tempel," *Tempelkult und Tempelzerstörung (70 n.Chr). Festschrift für Clemens Thoma zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. S. Lauer and H. Ernst; JudCh, 15; Bern, 1995) 27–131.

Rossi, B. "La creazione della letteratura giudaica antica extrabiblica. Apocrifi e scritti giudaico-ellenistici," *Vivens Homo* 4 (1993) 225–268.

Rubinstein, A. "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21.

Russell, D.M. *"The New Heavens and the New Earth." Hope for the Creation in Jewish Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1996) 129–131.

Sacchi, P. "Das Slavische Henochbuch (Artikel Henochgestalt/Henochliteratur)," *Theologica Evangelica* 15 (1986) 47–50.

—, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield, 1996).

Schäfer, Peter, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin, 1975).

Schmidt, N. "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *JAOS* 41 (1921) 307–312.

Scholem, G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1954) 67.

—, *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (SJ, 3; Berlin, 1962) 62–65.

—, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965) 17, 30.

—, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York, 1991).

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes *et al.*; 4 vols.; Edinburg, 1973–1987) III.2.746–750.

Scopello, M. "Un rituel idéal d'intronisation dans trois textes gnostiques de Nag Hammadi," *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis. Papers Read at the First International Congress of Coptology* (Cairo, December 1976) (ed. R. McL. Wilson; NHS, 14; Leiden, 1978) 91–95.

—, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *VC* 34 (1980) 367–385.

Segal, Alan, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25; Leiden, 1977).

—, "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Their Environment," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II/23.2 (1980) 1333–1394 at 1378–1379.

Seidel, H. "Lobgesänge im Himmel und auf Erden," *Gottesvolk. Beiträge zu einem Thema biblischer Theologie. Festschrift für S. Wagner* (Berlin, 1991) 114–124.

Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) "Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе," *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В.И. Ламанского* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.

—, "О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4/1 (Москва, 1907) 9–11.

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Описание рукописей Библиотеки Историко-Филологического Института Князя Безбородко в г. Нежине* (Москва, 1900).

—, "Русские памятники письменности в южнославянских литературах XIV–XVI вв.," in: Speranskij, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 55–103.

Sreznevskij, V.I. (Срезневский, В.И.) "Отчёт о поездке в Олонецкую, Вологодскую и Пермскую губернии," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности* 8 (1903) 4.109–123.

Sterling, G.E. "Recherché or Representative? What is the Relationship between Philo's Treatises and Greek-Speaking Judaism?" *Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999) 1–30 at 8–10.

Stichel, R. *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau: Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (ADAWG, 112; Göttingen, 1979) 42–54.

Stojanović, L. *Katalog rukopisa i starih schtampanih knjiga* (Belgrad, 1901).

—, *Katalog Narodne Biblioteke u Beogradu. IV: Rukopisi i Stare Schtampane Knjige* (Belgrad, 1903).

Stone, M. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen, 1984).

—, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–157.

—, "Jewish Tradition, the Pseudepigrapha, and the Christian West," *The Aramaic Bible. Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara; JSOTSup, 166; Sheffield, 1994) 431–449.

Stroev, P.M. (Строев, П.М.) *Библиологический словарь* (С.-Петербург, 1882).

Stroumsa, Gedialahu, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288.

—, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS, 24; Leiden, 1984) 24.

Stuhlmacher, P. *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus* (Göttingen, 1966) 169–170.

Tantlevskij, I.R. (Тантлевский, И.Р.) *Книги Еноха* (Москва-Иерусалим, 2000).

Tennant, F.R. *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge, 1903) 142–143, 204–211.

Theophilus, P. *The Interpretation of Genesis 14:17–24. A Historical, Methodological, and Exegetical Study* (Diss. Southern Baptist Seminary, 1979) 87–91.

Thompson, F.J. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anläßlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deuschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354 at 334.

Tihomirov, M. (Тихомиров, М.) *Исследование о Русской Правде. Происхождение текстов* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941).

Trafton, J.L. "Enoch, Second," *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. W.E. Mills, et al.; Macon, GA, 1990) 253.

Turdeanu, É. "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 138 (1950) 22–52; 176–218.

—, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Atti dello VIII congresso internazionale di studi bizantini. Palermo, 3–10 aprile 1951* (SRN, 8; Roma, 1953) 2.47–52.

—, "Une curiosité de l'Hénoch slave: Les phénix du sixième ciel," *Revue des études slaves* 47 (1968) 53–54.
—, "Dieu créa l'homme de huit éléments et tira son nom des quatre coins du monde," *Revue des études roumaines* 13–14 (1974) 163–194.
—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981)
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Апокриф о Енохе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 40–41.
Van den Broek, R. *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO, 24; Leiden, 1971).
VanderKam, J.C. *Enoch. A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC, 1995) 158–161.
Van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. "The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature," *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN 3; Leiden, 2000) 34–62.
Viktorov, A.E. (Викторов, А.Е.) *Каталог славяно-русских рукописей приобретённых Московским Публичным и Румянцевским Музеями в 1868 г. после Д.В. Пискарёва* (Москва, 1871).
—, *Очерк собрания рукописей В.М. Ундольского, в полном составе (Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского описанные самим составителем и бывшим владельцем собрания с номера 1-го по 579-й. Издание Московского Публичного и Румянцевского Музеев)* (Москва, 1870).
—, *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России* (С.-Петербург, 1890).
Vivian, A. "I movimenti che si oppongono al tempio: il problema del sacerdozio di Melchisedeq," *Henoch* 14 (1992) 97–112.
Volz, P. *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1934 [repr. Hildesheim, 1966]) 34–35.
Vostokov, A. (Востоков, А.) *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского Музея* (С.-Петербург, 1842).
Vulchanov, S. (Вълчанов Славчо) "*Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи*," *Годишник на Духовната Академия "Св. Климент Охридский"* 23 (1973/1974) (София: 1976) 234, 242–249, 282–291.
Wedderburn, A.J.M. *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background* (WUNT, 44; Tübingen, 1987) 178–179.
Wells, L.S.A. "The Historical Succession of the Books of Enoch: The Secrets of Enoch," *International Journal of Apocrypha* 25 (1911) 30–34.
Wewers, G.A. *Geheimnis und Geheimhaltung im rabbinischen Judentum* (Berlin and New York, 1975).
Wicks, H.J. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (Diss. London, 1915 [repr. New York, 1971]).
Wuttke, G. *Melchisedech, der Priesterkönig von Salem. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (BZNW, 5; Gießen, 1927) 40–41.
Yarbro Collins, A. "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses," *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup, 50; Leiden, 1996) 21–54.

Zerbe, G.M. *Non-Retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts. Ethical Themes in Social Contexts* (JSPSup, 13; Sheffield, 1993) 161–164.
Zwiep, A.W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (NovTSup, 87; Leiden, 1997) 49–51.

Enochic Fragment about the Two Tablets

a. *Texts*

Popov, A. (Попов, А.) *Книга бытия небеси и земли* (*Палея историческая*) *с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881) 14–17.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 221–222.
Vassiliev, A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893) 196–198.

c. *Research*

Orlov, A. "Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: 'Two Tablets' Traditions from the Book of Giants to Palaea Historica," *JSJ* 32 (2001) 137–158.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 51–52.

Fragment about the Flood

(О Потопе)

a. *Texts*

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "О потопе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.108–112.

b. *Translations*

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "О потопе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.109–113.
Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "О потопе," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 28–32.

c. *Research*

Dähnhardt, O. *Natursagen*: *Eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden* (Leipzig und Berlin, 1907) 1.257–266.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "О потопе," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.373–374.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 52.

Utley, F.L. *The Devil in the Ark* (Chillicothe, 1959).

Apocalypse of Abraham

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Книга о Аврааме праотци и патриарси," *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов: Шевченка, 1896–1910) 1.80–86.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Откровение Авраама," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 99–100.

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868) 65–151 at 83–91.

Novickij, P.P. (Новицкий, П.П.) "Откровение Авраама," *Общество любителей древней письменности 99* (С.-Петербург, 1891) (facsimile edition).

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 111–130.

—, "Палея Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г." *Труды учеников Н. С. Тихонравова. Том 1.* (Москва, 1892).

Philonenko-Sayar, B., and Philonenko, M. *L'apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes* (Semitica, 31; Paris, 1981).

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 24–36.

Rubinkiewicz, R., *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin, 1987). (Diss. Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1977).

De Santos Otero, A. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen* (PTS 20, 23; Berlin/New York, 1978–1981).

Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский Измаил Иванович) *Сказания о святых Борисе*

и Глебе. Сильвестровский список XIV века (С.-Петербург, 1860).
—, "Книга Откровение Авраама," *Известия Императорской академии наук по отделению русского языка и словестности*. Том 10. (С.-Петербург, 1961–1963) 648–645.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863) 1.32–77.

b. *Translations*

Bonwetsch, G.N., *Die Apokalypse Abrahams. Das Testament der vierzig Märtyrer* (Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche, Bd.1, Heft 1; Leipzig, 1897).
Box, G.H., and Landsman, J.I., *The Apocalypse of Abraham. Edited, with a Translation from the Slavonic Text and Notes* (TED, 1.10; London, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918).
Enrietti, M. and Sacchi, P. "Apocalisse di Abramo," *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; Ed. P. Sacchi, et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 3.61–110.
Gaster, M., "The Apocalypse of Abraham. From the Roumanian Text, Discovered and Translated," in: M. Gaster, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archeology* (London: Maggs Brothers, 1925) (repr. New York, 1971) 1.92–123.
Kulik, A. (Кулик, Александр) *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (TCS, 3; Atlanta, 2004) 9–35.
Pennington, A., "Apocalypse of Abraham," *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984) 363–491.
Petkanova, D. (Петканова Донка) "Откровение на Авраам," in: Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Донка Петканова и Анисава Милтенова) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 17–30.
Philonenko-Sayar, B., and Philonenko, M., "Die Apokalypse Abrahams," *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5.5.* (Gütersloh, 1982) 413–460.
—, "Apocalypse d'Abraham," in: *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (ed. A. Dupont-Sommer *et al.*; La Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris, 1987) 1691–1730.
Rießler, P., "Apokalypse des Abraham," in: *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Freiburg i. B., 1928 [Repr. Freiburg i.B., 1979]) 13–39; 1267–1269.
Rubinkiewicz, R., "The Apokalypse of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 1.681–705.
—, "Apocalypsa Abrahama," *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu* (ed. R. Rubinkiewicz; Warszawa, 1999) 460–481.

b. *Studies*

Aalen, S. *Heilsverlangen und Heilsverwirklichung. Studien zur Erwartung des Heils in der apokalyptischen Literatur des antiken Judentums und im ältesten Christentum* (ALGHJ, 21; Leiden, New York/København/Köln, 1990) 50–51.
Bamberger, B.J. "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *IDB* 1.21.
Baudry, G.-H. "Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament," *MSR* 49 (1992) 163–192 at 182–184.
—, "La théorie du 'penchant mauvais' et la doctrine du 'péché originel,'" *BLE*

95 (1994) 271–301 at 282.
—, "La responsibilité d'Ève dans la chute. Analyse d'une tradition," *MSR* 53 (1996) 293–320 at 300–301.
Beer, B. *Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage* (Leipzig, 1859).
Begg, C.T. "Rereadings of the 'Animal Rite' of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 36–46 at 43–45.
Boccaccini, G. "Testi apocalittici coevi all'Apocalisse di Giovanni," *RSB* 7 (1995) [*Apocalittica e origini cristiane. Atti del V convegno di studi neotestamentari (Seiano, 15–18 settembre 1993)*. Ed. R. Penna], 151–161 at 154–155.
Bohak, G. "Apocalypse of Abraham," *OxDJR* 55.
Bowley, J.B. "The Compositions of Abraham," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; SBLEJL, 6; Atlanta, 1994) 215–238.
Calvert, N.L. *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature: Implications for the Interpretation of Galatians and Romans* (Ph.D. Diss.: Sheffield, 1993) 262–294.
Cavallin, H.C. "Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I," *ANRW* 2.19.1 (Berlin/New York, 1979) 240–345 at 300–302.
Charlesworth, J.H., "The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986) 19–41 at 33–37.
—, "Folk Traditions in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *Mysteries and Revelations. Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Conference* (JSPSup, 9; Sheffield, 1991) 91–113.
—, "Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments," *TRE* 27.639–645 at 643.
Christoffersson, O. *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature. The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18–27* (ConBNT, 23; Stockholm, 1990) 91–92.
Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Ph.D. Diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 49–51, 319–324.
De Conick, A.D. "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999) 308–341 at 314–315.
Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (JudUm, 8; Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York, 1984) 248–255, 260–261.
Delcor, M., "Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive. Histoire et traditions," *RHR* 190 (1976) 3–53 at 49–50.
Denis, A.-M., *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTR, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 37–38.
Flusser, D. "Abraham and the Upanishads," *Imm* 20 (1986) 53–61 at 55.
Fossum, J. "'In the Beginning Was the Name.' Onomanology as the Key to Johannine Christology," *"The Image of the Invisible God." Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christianity* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1995) 108–133 at 120–122.
Frey, J.B. "Abraham (Apocalypse d')," *Dictionnaire de la Bible* 1.28–38.
Gaines, E.A. *The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in Biblical Literature* (Ph.D. Diss.; Princeton Theological Seminary, 1987) 163–170.
Géoltrain, P., *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham* (Diss. Straßburg, 1960).

Ginzberg, L., "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *JE* (1904) 1.91–92.
Grabbe, L., "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987) 152–167 at 156–158.
Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентові-заочнику)," *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
Gutiérrez-Larraya, J.A. "Abraham, Apocalipses de," *EncBib* 1, col. 83.
Hahn, F. *Frühjüdische und urchristliche Apokalyptik. Eine Einführung* (BThSt, 36; Neukirchen–Vluyn, 1998) 87.
Hall, R.G. "The 'Christian Interpolation' in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *JBL* 107 (1988) 107–112.
—, *Revealed Histories. Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (JSPSup., 6; Sheffield, 1991) 21–32; 75–78.
Halperin, D.J. "Ascension or Invasion: Implications of the Heavenly Journey in Ancient Judaism," *Religion* 18 (1988) 47–67 at 53–54.
—, *The Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen; Mohr, 1988) 103–113.
Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 53–54, 145–146.
Harrisville, R.A., III. *The Figure of Abraham in the Epistles of St. Paul. In the Footsteps of Abraham* (San Francisco, 1992) 71–74.
Helm, R.T. *The Development of the Azazel Tradition* (Ph.D. Diss.; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1992).
—, "Azazel in Early Jewish Tradition" *Andrews University Seminary Papers* 32 (1994) 217–226 at 222–224.
Helmbold, A.K. "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *ZPEB* 1.26–27.
Henrichs, A. "'Thou Shalt Not Kill a Tree': Greek, Manichaean and Indian Tales," *BASP* 16 (1979) 85–108 at 105–106.
Himmelfarb, M. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford, 1993) 61–66.
Hughes, H.M. *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (Diss.; London, 1909 [rep. London, 1928]) 18, 138–139, 210–212, 241, 308.
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Палейное сказание об Аврааме," in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897) 15–26.
James, M.R. "Apocrypha," *EncB* 1, cols. 249–261 at 253–254.
Jaubert, A. *La notion de l'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (PS, 6; Paris, 1963) 284–285.
Jenks, G.C. *The Origins and Development of the Antichrist Myth* (BZNW, 59; Berlin/New York, 1991) 248–288.
Kohler, K. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada. II. The Apocalypse of Abraham and Its Kindred," *JQR* 7 (1894/95) 581–606.
Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 134.
Kulik, A. (Кулик, Александр) "Об одном церковнославянском гапаксе," *Paleoslavica* 5 (1997) 339–345.
—, "К датировке 'Откровения Авраама,'" *In Memoriam*: *Памяти Я.С. Лурье* (С.-Петербург, 1997) 189–195.

—, "Откровение Авраама," *Вестник Еврейского Университета* 5 (2002) 231–254.
—, "The Gods of Nahor: A Note on the Pantheon of the Apocalypse of Abraham," *JJS* LIV (2003) 228–232.
—, "Interpretation and Reconstruction: Retroverting the Apocalypse of Abraham," *Apocrypha* 13 (2002) 203–226.
—, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (TCS, 3; Atlanta, 2004).
Lagrange, M.J. "Notes sur le messianisme au temps de Jésus," *RB* 14 (1905) 481–514.
Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 4–25.
Licht, J., "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *EncJud* 2 (1972) 125–127.
Lods, Adolphe, Caquot, André et Gérard E. Weil, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive depuis les origines jusqu'à la ruine de l'état juif (135 après J.-C.)* (Paris, 1982) 944–946.
Lohfink, G. "Der präexistente Heilsplan. Sinn und Hintergrund der dritten Vaterunserbitte," *Neues Testament und Ethik* (Freiburg-i-Br., 1989) 110–133.
Lunt, H.G. "The Transmission of the Apocalypse of Abraham," in: Rubinkiewicz, R., "The Apocalypse of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 1.681–705 at 686–688.
—, "On the Language of the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham," *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 7 (1985) 55–62.
Mach, M. "From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism?" *EncApoc* 229–264 at 255–258.
McGonigal, T.P. *"Abraham Believed God": Genesis 15:6 and Its Use in the New Testament* (Ph.D. Diss.; Fuller Theological Seminary, 1981) 167–171.
Mell, U. *Neue Schöpfung. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* (BZNW, 56; Berlin/New York, 1989) 169–170.
Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский Никита Александрович) "Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв." *TODRL* 20 (1964) 180–231 at 191,203.
—, *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV веков* (Ленинград, 1978).
Miltenova, A. "Апокрифи за Авраам," in: *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 31–33.
—, "Апокрифи за Авраам," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 40–42.
Mueller, J.R., "The Apocalypse of Abraham and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple," *SBLSP* 21 (1982) 341–349.
Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia, 1981) 294–299.
—, "Abraham the Convert: A Jewish Tradition and its Use by the Apostle Paul," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, 1998) 151–175 at 164–165.
Niebuhr, K.-W. *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT II, 29; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1987) 198–200.

Oegema, G.S. *The Anointed and His People. Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup, 27; Sheffield, 1998) 212–215. [*Der Gesalbte und sein Volk. Untersuchungen zum Konzeptualisierungsprozess der messianischen Erwartungen von den Makkabäern bis Bar Koziba* (SIJD, 2; Göttingen, 1994)]
—, *Für Israel und die Völker. Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie* (NovTSup, 95; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1999) 151–152.
Otzen, B. "The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (ed. P. Bilde, et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154 at 143–144.
Paleja Tolkovaja, *Палея Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г. Трудъ учениковъ Н.С. Тихонравова* (Москва, 1892).
Philonenko, M. "Le Poimandrès et la liturgie juive," in: *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité* (ed. F. Dunand *et al.*, EPRO, 46; Leiden, 1975) 204–211.
—, "L'Anguipède alectorocéphale et le dieu Iaô," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1979) 297–304.
—, "Abraham. VI. Apokryphe Schriften," *LTK* 1, col. 65.
Puech, É. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (ÉB, 21; 2 vols.; Paris: Gabalda, 1993) 1.145–149.
Reid, G.J. "Apocrypha," *CathEnc* 1.601–615 at 604.
Rowland, C. "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *JSJ* 10 (1979) 137–154.
—, "The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material," *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135. The Second Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September, 1989)* (ed. J.D.G. Dunn; WUNT, 66; Tübingen, 1992) 213–237 at 219–222.
Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Апокрифы об Аврааме в древнерусской письменности," *Академик Василий Михайлович Истрин. Тезисы докладов обл. научных чтений посвященных 125-летию со дня рождения ученого-филолога* (Одесса, 1990) 74–75.
Rubinkiewicz, R., "Apokalipsa Abrahama," *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 27 (1974) 230–237.
—, "La vision de l'histoire dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham," *ANRW* 2.19.1. (1979) 137–151.
—, "Les sémitismes dans l'Apocalypse d'Abraham," *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1989) 141–148.
—, "Apokalipsa Abrahama 1–6. Propozycja interpretacji symbolicznej," *RTK* 29 (1982) 79–94.
—, *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament* (tr. H. Ulrich; ÖBS, 6; Klosterneuberg, 1984).
—, "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *ABD* 1.41–43.
Rubinstein, A. "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *JJS* 4 (1953) 108–115.
—, "Hebraisms in the Slavonic 'Apocalypse of Abraham,'" *JJS* 5 (1954) 132–135.
—, "A Problematic Passage in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *JJS* 8 (1957) 45–50.

Saylor, G.B. *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch* (SBLDS, 72; Chico, 1984) 134–139.
Schein, B.E. *Abraham in the Non-Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period* (Ph.D. Diss.; Yale University, 1972) 19–92.
Scholem, G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1946).
—, *Die jüdische Mystik in ihren Hauptströmungen* (Frankfurt a. M., 1980) 74–75.
Schüngel-Straumann, Helen. *Die Frau am Anfang. Eva und die Folgen* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1989) 70–72.
Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)* (ed. G. Vermes *et al.*, Edinburg, 1986) 3.1.288–687.
Segal, A.F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environment," *ANRW* 2.23.2 (Berlin/New York, 1981) 1334–1394 at 1362–1364.
Slater, T.B. "One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism," *NTS* 41 (1995) 183–198 at 196–197.
Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский И.И.) "Дополнения к общему повременному обозрению древних памятников русского письма и языка," *ИОРЯС* 10 (1861–1863) 448–665.
Steinmann, A.E. *The Shape of Things to Come. The Genre of the Historical Apocalypse in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature* (Ph.D. Diss.; Michigan, 1990) 122–126.
Stökl, D. "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood. Yom Kippur in Zechariah 3, 1 Enoch 10, 11Q Melchizedek, Hebrews and the Apocalypse of Abraham 13," *Transformation of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (ed. J. Assmann and G. Stroumsa; NumenSup, 83; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 1999) 349–366 at 358–361.
Stone, M. "Apocalyptic Literature," in: M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Philadelphia, 1984) 383–441; 415–418.
Stroumsa, G.A. *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS, 24; Leiden, 1984) 24–25.
Thompson, F.J. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anläßlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deuschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354 at 333.
Trafton, J.L. "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *MercerDB* 7.
Turdeanu, É. "L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en slave," *JSJ* 3 (1972) 153–180.
—, "L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en slave," in: É. Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 173–200, 439.
Van Stempvort, P.A. "Abrahams Apokalypse," *BHH* 1, col. 15.
Vandergriff, K.L. *The Messianic Significance of the "Seed of Abraham" Concept in Pre-Christian Judaism* (Ph.D. Diss.; Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988) 141–143.
VanderKam, J.C. "Messianism and Apocalypticism," *EncApoc* 193–228 at 212–213.
Volz, P. *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den*

Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur (Tübingen, 1934) 48–49.
Weinel, H. "Die spätere christliche Apokalyptik," *ΕΥΗΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstage, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden* (ed. H. Schmidt; FRLANT, 36; Göttingen, 1923) 141–173 at 167–170.
Weitzman, S. "The Song of Abraham," *HUCA* 56 (1994) 21–33.
Wernik, N.A. *A Critical Analysis of the Book of Abraham in the Light of Extracanonical Jewish Writings* (Diss. Bringham Young University, 1968).
Whitney, K.W., Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Ph.D. Diss.; Harvard University, 1992) 88–105.
Wicks, R.H. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (Diss.; London, 1915 [rep. New York, 1971]) 23–24, 107–109, 240–244, 331–332.
Yarbro Collins, A. "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses," *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup, 50; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996) 21–54 at 34–36.

Testament of Abraham

a. *Texts*

Angelov, B. and M. Genov (Ангелов, Б. и М. Генов), "Смъртьта на Аврама," *Стара българска литература (IX–XVIII) въ примери, преводи и библиография* (История на българската литература в примери и библиография, 2; София: Паскалев, 1922) 194–196.
Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Слово о святом Авраамѣ," *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 4.104–108.
Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) *Prilozi k historiji književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga* (Agram, 1868) 65–151 at 83–89.
Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) "Сказание об Аврааме," *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]) 70–81.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Смерть Авраама," *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.79–90.
—, "Смерть Авраама," *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 58:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 1–14.

b. *Translations*

Petkanova, D. (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 88–98.
Smol'nikova, L.N. (Смольникова, Л.Н.) "Смерть Авраама," in: Mil'kov, V.V.

(ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 98–106.

c. *Research*

Badalanova, F. and Miltenova, A. (Бадаланова, Ф. и А. Милтенова) "Апокрифният цикъл за Авраам във фолклора и в средновековните балкански литератури," in: *Етнографски проблеми на народната култура. 4*. (С., 1996) 203–251.

Cooper, D.S., and Weber, H.B. "The Church Slavonic Testament of Abraham," *Studies in the Testament of Abraham* (ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SCS, 6; Missoula, 1976) 301–326.

Gaster, M., "The Apocalypse of Abraham. From the Roumanian Text, Discovered and Translated," in: M. Gaster, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archeology* (London: Maggs Brothers, 1925) (repr. New York, 1971) 1.92–124.

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Палейное сказание об Аврааме," in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897) 15–26.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Апокалипсис Авраама," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 95–99.

Javorskij, Ju. (Яворский, Ю.) "Два замечательных карпато-русских сборника XVIII в., принадлежащих Университету св. Владимира," *Киев. Унив. Изв.* 2 (1910) 67–68.

Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 25–31.

Miltenova, A. "Апокрифи за Авраам," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 31–33.

—, "Апокрифи за Авраам," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 40–42.

Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) "Тиквешки рукописъ или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.," *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 8 (1898) 388–418 at 411–413.

Polívka, G. "Die apokryphische Erzählung vom Tode Abrahams," *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 18 (1896) 112–125.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Апокрифы о Аврааме," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 47–49.

—, "Апокрифы об Аврааме в древнерусской письменности," *Академик Василий Михайлович Истрин. Тезисы докладов обл. научных чтений посвященных 125-летию со дня рождения ученого-филолога* (Одесса, 1990) 74–75.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Средневековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 38–60.

Strohal, R. *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priče i legende* (Bjelovar, 1917) 57–60.

Turdeanu, É. "Notes sur la tradition littéraire du Testament d'Abraham," *Silloge bizantina in onore di Silvio Giuseppe Mercati* (SBN, 11; Roma, 1957) 405–409.
—, "Le Testament d'Abraham en slave et en roumain," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 10 (1977) 1–38.
—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 201–239, 440.

Apocryphal Fragments about Melchizedek

(Апокрифы о Мелхиседеке)

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.92–101.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 53–55; 131–135; 222–225; 256–259.
Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 20–23.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.26–31.

b. *Translations*

Tarkovskij, R.B. (Тарковский, Р.Б.) "Сказание о Мелхиседеке," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 33–36.

c. *Research*

Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) *Переводы и послания Максима Грека* (Ленинград, 1984) 142–143, 168–170.
Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентові-заочнику)," *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 53–55.
Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) "Апокрифы о Мелхиседеке," Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 62–63.

The Ladder of Jacob

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов: Шевченка, 1896–1910) 1.121–122.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 38–39

Leicht, R. "Qedushah and Prayer to Helios: A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer of Jacob," *JSQ* 6 (1999) 140–176. (the Hebrew version of the "Prayer of Jacob").

Paleja Tolkovaja, *Палея Толковая по списку сделанному в г. Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (Москва, 1892) 153–157.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Лествица Иакова," *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 58–59; 138–149.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 27–32.

Schäfer, P. and Shaked, S. *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (TSAJ, 64; Tübingen, 1997) 27–78. (the Hebrew version of the "Prayer of Jacob").

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.91–95.

Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893) л. 100 об. – 107 об.

Vtoryh, N.M. (Вторых, Н.М.) *Древности. Труды Славянской комиссии Московского археологического общества* 2 (1902) (Москва, 1902) протокол 1.

b. *Translations*

Bonwetsch, N., "Die Apokryphe 'Leiter Jakobs,'" *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (Göttingen, 1900) 76–87.

Enrietti, M. and Sacchi, P. "Scala di Giacobbe," *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (5 vols.; eds. P. Sacchi et al.; Torino/Brescia, 1981–1997) 3.553ff.

James, M.R. *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED, 1; Palestinian Jewish Texts, 14; London/New York, 1920) 96–103.

Lunt, H.G. "Ladder of Jacob," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983–1985) 2.401–411.

Migne, J.-P. *Dictionnaire des apocryphes, ou Collection de tous les livres apocryphes relatifs à l'Ancien et au Nouveau Testament* (2 vols.; Paris, 1856–1858 [repr. Turnhout, 1989]) 2.265.

Pennington, A. "The Ladder of Jacob," *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984) 453–463.
Vassiliev, A. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Москва, 1893).

c. *Research*

Böttrich, C. "Das 'Sanctus' in der Liturgie der hellenistischen Synagoge," *JbLH* 35 (1994–1995) 10–36 at 31.
Bratke, E., *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden* (TU 4.3; Leipzig, 1899) 101–106.
Charlesworth, J.H. "Jacob, Ladder of," *ABD* 3.609.
—, "Messianology in the Biblical Pseudepigrapha," *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, et al. Tübingen, 1998) 21–52 at 49.
Fossum, J. "The Son of Man's Alter Ego. John 1.51, Targumic Tradition and Jewish Mysticism," *"The Image of the Invisible God." Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christianity* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1995) 135–151 at 147–149.
Kugel, J. *In Potiphar's House. The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (San Francisco, 1990) 117–119.
—, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227.
Orlov, A.A. (Орлов Андрей Александрович) "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 284–285.
Rubinkiewicz, R., *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire* (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129; Lublin, 1987) 73–74.
Salmina, M.A. (Салмина, М.А.) "Лествица Иакова", Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 230–231.
Shchegolev, P.E. (Щеголев, П.Е.) "Очерки истории отречённой литературы: Сказание Афродитиана," *ИОРЯС* 4 (1899) 148–199; 1304–1344.
Sheeley, S. "Jacob, Ladder of," *MercerDB*, 425.
Svjatskij, D. (Святский, Д.) *Лестница Иакова или сон наяву* (С.-Петербург, 1911) 31–32.
Weinel, H. "Die spätere christliche Apokalyptik," *ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstage, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden* (ed. H. Schmidt; FRLANT, 36; Göttingen, 1923) 141–173 at 172–173.
Whitney, K.W. Jr. *Two Strange Beasts. A Study of Traditions Concerning Leviathan and Behemoth in Second Temple and Early Rabbinic Judaism* (Ph.D. Diss.; Harvard University, 1992) 117–136.

Joseph and Aseneth

a. *Texts*

Burchard, C. *Joseph und Aseneth serbisch-kirchenslavisch: Text und Varianten* (BDBAT, 2; Dielheim, 1980) 3–45 [= *Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth* (SVTP, 13; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1996) 53–92]

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Апокриф об Иосифе и Асенефе," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Императорского Московского Археологического Общества* 2 (1898) 146–199.

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) "Srpsko-slovenski zbornik iz vremena despota Stefana Lazarevića. 10. žitie Asenethi," *Starine* 9 (1877) 27–42.

c. *Research*

Bratulić, J. "Apokrifi o prekrasnom Josipu u hrvatskoj knizhevnosti," *Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta* 7 (1972) 31–123.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Иосиф," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 118–141 at 119–120.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Средневековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 61–70.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Заповіти дванацяти патріархів," *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.174–224.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Заветы 12-ти патриархов," *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 158–194.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 33–38.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Заветы двенадцати патриархов," in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.96–232.

c. *Research*

Charles, R.H. "Appendix IV: Christian Additions Made by the Slavonic Scribe in S^1," *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited from Nine Mss together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford, 1908 [repr. Hildesheim, 1966]) 257–262.

Gaylord, H.E. and Korteweg, T. "The Slavic Versions," *Studies in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation* (ed. M. de Jonge; SVTP, 3; Leiden, 1975) 140–143.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Заветы патриархов," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 141–165.

Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 32–64.

Morfill, W.R. "Appendix V: Retranslation of the Second Recension (S^2) of the Slavonic Version," in: Charles, R.H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Edited from Nine Mss together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford, 1908 [repr. Hildesheim, 1966]) 263–294.

Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф "Заветы двенадцати патриархов" в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).

Sergeev, V.N. (Сергеев, В.Н.) "Надписи на иконах праотеческого ряда иконостаса и апокрифические Заветы двенадцати патриархов," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 29 (1974) 306–320.

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) "Единъ югославянски превод отъ 'Заветите на дванадесетете патриарси,'" *Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина* 18 (1901) 242–251.

—, *Заветы двенадцати патриархов в старинной чешской письменности* (С.-Петербург, 1905).

Turdeanu, É. "Les Testaments des douze Patriarches en slave," *JSJ* 1 (1970) 148–184.

—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 239–275, 440–441.

Tvorogov, O.V. "Заветы двенадцати патриархов," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987), 183–184.

Testament of Job

a. *Texts*

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) "Apokrifna priča o Jovu," *Starine* 10 (1878) 157–170.

Polivka, G. "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu. XIII. Apokrifna priča o Jovu," *Starine* 24 (1891) 113–160 at 135–155.

b. *Translations*

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) "Apokrifna priča o Jovu," *Starine* 10 (1878) 157–170.

c. *Research*

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Иов," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 271–273.

Life of Moses

a. *Texts*

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Сказания о Моисее," *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки*. (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 67–68; 194–204; 259–260.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) "Сказания о Моисее," *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 39–50 at 39–48.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Житие пророка Моисея," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.120–148.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Исход Моисеев," *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.233–253.

Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893).

b. *Translations*

Bonwetsch, N. "Die Mosesage in der slawischen kirchlichen Literatur," in: *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1908) 581–607.

Meyer, A. *Légendes juives apocryphes sur la vie de Moïse; La Chronique de Moïse; L'Ascension de Moïse; La Mort de Moïse* (Paris, 1925).

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Житие пророка Моисея," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.121–149.

—, "Житие пророка Моисея," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 62–86.

c. *Research*

Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, Анатолий) "Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века," *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.

Bauckham, R.J. "Excursus: The Background and Source of Jude 9," in: *Jude. 2 Peter* (WBC, 50; Waco, 1993) 65–76 at 69–70.

Bonwetsch, G.N. "Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen Handschriften," in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2. 886–917 at 915.

Farrall, M.L. *A Jewish Translator in Kïevan Rus': A Critical Edition and Study of the Earliest Redaction of the Slavic "Life of Moses"* (Ph.D. Diss., Brown University, 1981).

Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української літератури (На допомогу студентові-заочнику)," *Українська мова і література в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.

Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) No. 136. 105.

Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 137.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 165ff.

Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 64–94.

Lunt, H.G. and Taube, M. "Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?" *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 148–187 at 157–158.

Ponyrko, N.V. (Понырко, Н.В.) "Апокрифы о Моисее," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 63–67.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 55ff.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская, М.В.) "Житие пророка Моисея," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.376–378.

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский М.Н.) "Русские памятники письменности в югославянских литературах XIV–XV вв.," *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, [1938] 1960) 55–103 at 67–77.

Taube, M. "The Slavic *Life of Moses* and Its Hebrew Sources," *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 84–119.

Thompson, F.J. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anläßlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deuschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 327–387 at 334.

Turdeanu, É. "La Chronique de Moïse en russe," *Revue des études slaves* 46 (1967) 35–64.

—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 276–305, 441.

Apocryphal Fragments about David

(Апокрифы о Давиде)

a. *Texts*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910) 1.272–279.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург, 1906) 110–116.

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and R.B. Tarkovskij (R.B. Tarkovskij) "Сказания о царе Давиде," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.160–170.

Kuprijanov, I. (Куприянов, И.) "Описание замечательной Псалтири," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 88.2 (1855) 165–167.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Сказание за Сивила," in: T'pkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Тъпкова-Заимова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 264–271.

Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) "Тиквешки рукописъ или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.," *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 8 (1898) 388–418.

Peretc, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Отчет об экскурсии семинария русской филологии в Москву 1–12 февраля 1912 года* (Киев, 1912) 25–26.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 237, 242–243.

Undol'skij, V.M. (Ундольский, В.М.) *Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского* (Москва, 1870) 16.

b. *Translations*

Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and R.B. Tarkovskij (R.B. Tarkovskij) "Сказания о царе Давиде," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.161–171.

—, "Сказания о царе Давиде," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 37–46.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Слово за Сивила," in: Bozhilov, I., et al., eds., (Божилов, И. и Кожухаров С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 156–158.

—, "Сказание за Сивила," in: T'pkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Тъпкова-Заимова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 272–273.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.99–106, 363–366.
Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) "Слово за пророкот Давид и цар како се зачна," in: Koneski, B. and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987) 23–27.
—, "Слово како го исписа Давид псалтирот," in: Koneski, B. and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Конески, Б. и Стојчевска-Антиќ, В.) *Тиквешки сборник* (Скопје, 1987) 27–28.

c. *Research*

Franko, I. (Франко, Іван) "Із старых рукописів," *Житіе і слово* 3 (1895) 141–142.
Istrin, V. (Истрин, В.) "Из области древнерусской литературы," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 8 (1903) 404–413.
Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 173–193.
—, "Из истории апокрифов и легенд в южнославянской письменности," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.2 (1909) 290–294.
Kagan, M.D. (Каган, М.Д.) "Апокрифы о Давиде," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.52–59.
Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) and Р.Б. Тарковский (R.B. Tarkovskij) "Сказания о царе Давиде," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.380–385.
Karskij, E.F. (Карский, Е.Ф.) *Западнорусские сказания о Сивилле пророчице по рукописи XVI в.* (Варшавские университетские известия, 2; Варшава, 1898).
Lourié, B. (Лурье, Василий) "Славянское 'Сказание о Псалтири' и его историко-литургическое значение," *Byzantinoslavica* LXII (1996) 140–155.
Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "'Сказание за Сивила' (Археографски бележки, текстологическо изследване, издание на текста)," *Palaeobulgarica* 8.4 (1984) 44–72.
—, "Problems of Old Bulgarian Translation of the *Skazanie za Sibyla*," *Études balkaniques* 3–4 (1992) 72–76.
—, "Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 33–34.
—, "Сказание за Сивила," in: T'pkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Тъпкова-Заимова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996) 251–276.
—, "Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска Литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 42–43.
Nachov, N.A. (Начов, Н.А.) "Тиквешки рукописъ или сборник от апокрифни сказания, легенди, повести и пр.," *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука, и книжнина* 10 (1894) 106–112.

"Отчет командированного за границу приват-доцента Московского университета Василия Истрина за вторую половину 1894 года," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 6 (1896) 68–75.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 68–69, 93–94.

Apocryphal Fragments about Solomon

(Апокрифы о Соломоне)

a. *Texts*

Lurie, J. "Une légende inconnue de Salomon et Kitovras dans un manuscript du XV siècle," *Revue des études slaves* 43 (1964) 7–12.

Prohorov, G.M., (Прохоров, Г.М.) "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.67–87.

—, "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.172–190.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 51–71.

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.254–272.

b. *Translations*

Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., К. Куев и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 207–209.

Gromov, M.N. (Громов, М.Н.) "О значении термина 'философ' на Руси," *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Москва, 1989) 447–480.

Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "О Соломоне и Китоврасе," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 156–166.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 85–94.

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 1.106–122, 366–368.

Prohorov, G.M., (Прохоров, Г.М.) "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.67–87.

—, "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.173–191.

—, "Суды Соломона," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 47–61.

c. *Research*

Alekseev, A. (Алексеев Анатолий) "Переводы с древнееврейских оригиналов в древней Руси," *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987) 1–20.

—, "Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века," *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.

Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский А.С.) К истории южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы. Два любопытных сборника Софийской народной библиотеки в Болгарии," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4 (1899) 127–130.

Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А. Я.) "К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе," *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.

Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) *Легенда о заключенном бесе в византийской и старинной русской литературе* (I–III; Москва, 1905).

Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "О Соломоне и Китоврасе," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 167–168.

Istoki, *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 321–322, 327–331.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 270–272.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург 1906) 110–114.

—, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 173–220.

Jaroshenko-Titova, L.V. (Ярошенко-Титова, Л.В.) "'Повесть об увозе Соломоновой жены' в русской рукописной традиции," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 29 (1974) 260–261.

Lourié, B. (Лурье, Василий) "Чаша Соломона—Чаша Ездры. Элементы раннехристианского благочестия в Житии святого равноапостольного Кирилла, Учителя Словенского, и их значение для истории текста," in: *Славяне и их соседи* 5 (Москва, 1994) 9–25.

Lur'e, Ja. S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Апокрифы о Соломоне," Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 1.66–68.

Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) "Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 33–34.

—, "Апокрифи за Давид и за Соломон," in: *Старобългарска Литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 42–43.

Minc, S.I. (Минц, С.И.) "Черты индивидуального и традиционного творчества в сказках о царе Соломоне," *Художественный фольклор* (вып. IV–V; Москва, 1929).

Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Донка) "От литературата към фолклора (Народни творби за Соломон и Давид)," *БФ* 4 (1977) 39–48.

Petrov, A.N. (Петров А.Н.) "Апокрифическое пророчество царя Соломона о чаше," *Памятники древней письменности* CIV (С.-Петербург, 1894).

Prohorov, G.M. (Прохоров, Г.М.) "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 4.541–542.

—, "Суды Соломона," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.385–386.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Старинные сказки о царе Соломоне*: *Исторические чтения о языке и словесности* (С.-Петербург, 1855) 262–284.

Speranskij, M.N. "Заметки о рукописях Белградских и Софийских библиотек," *Известия Историко-филологического Института в Нежине* 16 (1898) 67–73.

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) "Личноста на Соломон во средневековните текстови и во македонскиот фолклор," in: Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Мегу книжевен текст и фолклор* (Скопје, 1987).

Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский, А.Н.) *Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе и западные легенды о Морольфе и Мерлине* (С.-Петербург, 1872).

—, *Из истории литературного общения востока и запада. Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе* (С-Петербург, 1879).

—, "Новые данные к истории Соломоновых сказаний," in: *Приложение к т. 40 Записок Академии Наук* (С.-Петербург, 1881).

Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) "'Пророчество Соломона' из собрания Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря," in: *Монастырская культура*: *Восток и Запад* (ed. Е.Г. Водолазкин; С.-Петербург, 1999) 59–67.

—, "Пророчество Соломона и Толковая Палея," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 42 (2001) 518–539.

Apocryphal Fragments about Elijah

(Апокрифы о Илье Пророке)

a. *Texts*

Kliment Ohridski (Климент Охридски) *Събрани съчинения* (съст. Б. Ст. Ангелов, К.М. Куев, Хр. Кодов; София, 1970) 1.673–706.

Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров, П.А.) "Похвала Илье пророку: Новое слово Климента Словенского," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 6.3 (1901) 236–280.

c. *Research*

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 232–246.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Апокрифы о Илье Пророке," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книж-*

ников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.) (Ленинград, 1987) 58–59.
Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сочинения и сказания в древней русской письменности и влияние их на народные духовные стихи* (Тула, 1879).
Smirnova, Je. S. (Смирнова Э.С.) *Живопись Великого Новгорода: сер. XIII – нач. XV в.* (Москва, 1976) 261–262.
Toporov, V.N. (Топоров, В.Н.) *Исследования в области славянских древностей* (Москва, 1974) 164–170.
Uspenskij, B.A. (Успенский, Б.А.) *Филологичесие разыскания в области славянских древностей* (Москва, 1982) 40.

Ascension of Isaiah

a. *Texts*

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) "Видение Исаиево," *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 134–149.
Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) "Видение Исайи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С-Петербург, 1999) 504–516.
Popov, A.N. (Попов, Андрей Николаевич) *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1872) 414–419.
—, "Библиографические материалы," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 1,7 (1879) 1–48 at 13–20.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Видение пророка Исайи," *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 73–81.
Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Видение пророка Исайи," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.192–202.
Shahmatov, A.S. and Lavrov, P. (Шахматов, А.С. и Лавров, П.) "Видение св. пророка Исайи," in: "Сборник XII века Московского Успенского собора. Вып. 1.," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2,3 (1899). [repr., Apophoreta Slavica, 1; ed. D. Chizhevskij; S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co, 1957] 129–136.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 32–47.

b. *Translations*

Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) "Видение Исаево," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 155–160.
Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "Видение Исайи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 91–96.

Kaliganov, I., et al., (Калиганов И.) *Родник златоструйный*: *Памятники болгарской литературы IX–XVIII веков* (Москва, 1990).

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) "Видение Исайи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С-Петербург, 1999) 517–523.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Видение пророка Исайи," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.193–203.

c. *Research*

Giambelluca Kossova, A. (Джамбелука-Коссова, А.) "Наблюдения върху старобългарската традиция на Видение Исайево—съответствия и различия с текстовете на Възнесение Исайево," *Palaeobulgarica* 7.2 (1983) 66–79.

—, "Osservazioni sulla tradizione paleoslava della *Visione di Isaia*: coincidenze e divergenze con la tradizione testuale dell'*Ascensione di Isaia*," *La cultura bulgara nel medioevo balcanico tra Oriente e Occidente europeo. Atti del 8 Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 3–6 novembre 1981* (Spoleto, 1983) 167–186.

—, "Един пренебрегнат ръкопис на 'Видение Исайево': Яцимирски Препис 19," *Palaeobulgarica* 12.4 (1988) 13–25.

—, "Una testimonianza inesplorata della versione paleoslava della *Visione di Isaia*: il codice N. 1448 della cattedrale di S. Sofia di Novgorod," *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujchev* (Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia, 1; eds. P. Dinekov, et al., Sofia, 1988) 300–308.

—, "Visio Isaiae. Versione Paleobulgara," in: P. Bettiolo, A. Giambelluca Kossova, C. Leonardi, E. Norelli, and L. Perrone, *Ascensio Isaiae. Textus* (CCSA, 7; Turnhout, 1995) 235–319.

Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян, В.М.) "Видение Исайи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (ed.) (Мильков В.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси. Тексты и Исследования* (Москва, 1997) 96–97.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 247–250.

Kagan, M.D., Ponyrko, N.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, M. (Каган М.Д., Понырко Н.В., Рождественская М.) "Описание сборников XV в. Книгописца Ефросина," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 64.

Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 97–99.

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) "Видение Исайи," in: Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С-Петербург, 1999) 523–527.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 294–305.

Radchenko, K.F. (Радченко, К.Ф.) "Этюды по богомильству. Видение пророка Исайи в пересказах катаров-богомилов," *Сборник статей по литературе и истории в честь Н.П. Дашкевича* (Киев, 1906) 229–234.

Rozhdestvenskaja, M.D. (Рождественская, М.Д.) "Видение пророка Исайи," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.386–387.
Rystenko, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) *К литературной истории апокрифа* "*Восхождение Исайи*" (Одесса, 1912).
Stojanović, L. (Стояновић, Л.) "Стари српски хрисовуљи, акти, биографије, летописи, типици, поменици, записи и др.," *Споменик* (Београд, 1890) 190–193, 193–194.
Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 81–90.
Tisserant, E. *Ascension d'Isaïe. Traduction de la version éthiopienne avec les principales variantes des versions grecque, latines et slave* (Paris, 1909).
Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 145–172, 438–439.
Vaillant, A. "Un apocryphe pseudo-bogomile: la Vision d'Isaïe," *Revue des études slaves* 42 (1963) 109–121.

3 Baruch

a. *Texts*

Gaylord, H.E. "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.
—, "Славянский текст Третьей книги Варуха," *Polata Knigopisnaja* 7 (1983) 49–56.
—, "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch," *SLOVO* 37 (1987) 91–115.
Hercigonja, E. "'Videnje Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63–93.
Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]) 191–206.
Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) "Откровение Варуха," *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]) 149–151.
Novaković, S. "Otkrivene Varuhovo," *Starine* 18 (1886) 203–209.
Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) "Апокрифическое откровение Варуха," *Древности Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.1 (Москва, 1907) 201–258.
Srećković, P.S. "Зборник попа Драгольа. Садржина и пророштва," *Споменик* 5 (1890) 3–20.
Stojchevska-Antić, V. *Апокрифи* (Skopje, 1996) 91–99.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Откровение Варуха," *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 48–54.

b. *Translations*

Bonwetsch, G.N. "Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch," *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: philologisch-historische Klasse* (1896) 91–101.

Dinekov, P., Kuev, K., Petkanova, D. (Динеков П., Куев, К., Петканова, Д.) "Откровение Варухово," *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1967) 160–161.
Gaylord, H.E. "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.653–655.
Hage, W. *Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse.* (JSHRZ, 5.1; Gütersloh, 1974) 15–44.
Karpov, A. Ju. (Карпов, А. Ю.) "Откровение Варуха," *Златострúй: Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1990) 275–281.
Morfill, W.R. "The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavic," in: M.R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (TS, 5.1; Cambridge, 1897 [rep. Nendeln, 1967]) 95–102.
Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "Откровение на свети Варух," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 71–76; 353–354.
—, "Откровение на свети Варух," in: Petkanova, D. and A. Miltenova (eds.) (Донка Петканова и Анисава Милтенова) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология* (Slavia Orthodoxa; София, 1993) 11–16.

c. *Research*

Andersen, F.I. "The Sun in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *Xristianskij Vostok* 4(10) (2006) 380–412.
Bauckham, R. "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," *JTS* 41 (1990) 355–385.
—, *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (SNT, 93; Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1998).
Baudry, G.-H. "Le péché originel dans les pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 49 (1992) 163–192 at 172–173.
Bohak, G. "Greek-Hebrew Gematrias in *3 Baruch* and in Revelation," *JSP* 7 (1990) 119–121.
Böklen, E. *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1902) 33, 57, 65–66.
Coleman, G.B. *The Phenomenon of Christian Interpolations into Jewish Apocalyptic Texts. A Bibliographical Survey and Methodological Analysis* (Diss.; Vanderbilt, 1976) 333–336.
Collins, J.J. "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen, 1983) 531–548 at 538–540.
—, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, et al.; HOS, 1.49; Leiden, 2000) 119–139 at 134.
Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (JudUm, 8; Frankfurt am Main/New York, 1984) 98–174.
Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа* (Скопје, 1978) 38.
Fischer, U. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin, 1978) 71–84.
Frasson, M. "La struttura dei cieli in 3 Baruch. Uno studio filologico," *Henoch* 14 (1992) 137–144.

Gaylord, H.E., "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.
—, *The Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch* (Diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983).
—, "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch," *SLOVO* 37 (1987) 91–115.
Gorskij, A. and Nevostruev, K. (Горский А. и Невоструев К.) *Описание славянских рукописей Московской синодальной библиотеки* (Москва, 1862) 2.3.752–753.
Gry, L. "Séjours et habitats divins d'après les apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 4 (1910) 694–722 at 709.
Hannah, D.D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2.109; Tübingen, 1999) 38–40, 44–45.
Harlow, D. *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christiantity* (SVTP, 12; New York, Köln: Brill, 1996 [Diss. Notre Dame, 1994]).
Heil, C. *Die Ablehnung der Speisegebote durch Paulus* (BBB, 96; Weinheim, 1994) 93–94.
Himmelfarb, M. *Tours of Hell. An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia, 1983 [Diss. Pennsylvania, 1981]) 61–63.
—, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford, 1993).
Hubaux, J. and Leroy, M. *Le mythe du phénix dans les littératures grecque et latine* (BFPLLiège, 82; Liège/Paris, 1939).
Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Варух," *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 227–232.
Jacobson, H. "A Note on the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 201–203.
James, M.R. "Notes on the Apocrypha VI: Traces of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch in Other Writings," *JTS* 16 (1914–1915) 410–413.
Jenks, G.C. *The Origins and Development of the Antichrist Myth* (BZNW, 59; Berlin/New York, 1991) 293–297.
Karpov, A. Ju. (Карпов, А. Ю.) "О календаре славянской книги 'Откровение Варуха,'" *Палестинский Сборник* 32 (1993) 81–83.
Klausner, J. "The Greek Book of Baruch," *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (Tr. W.F. Stinespring; New York, 1955) 382.
Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) "Откровение Варуха," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 67/3 (1899) 149–151.
—, "Заметка об апокрифах в рукописи Публичной библиотеки греч. 70," *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61–64.
Lüdtke, W. "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 218–231 at 219–222.
Maksimovich, K.A. (Максимович, К.А.) "Птица феникс в древнерусской литературе (К интерпретации образа)," *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Сб. 5; Москва, 1992) 316–334.
Orlov, A. "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003) 184–201.

Otzen, B. "The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen* (ed. P. Bilde et al.; Aarhus, 1993) 140–154 at 144.

Philonenko-Sayar, B. "La version slave de l'Apocalypse de Baruch," in: *La littérature intertestamentaire. Colloque de Strasbourg 17–19 octobre 1983)* (ed. A Caquot; Paris, 1985) 89–97.

Picard, J.-C. "Observations sur l'Apocalypse grecque de Baruch I. Cadre historique fictif et efficacité symbolique," *Semitica* 20 (1970) 77–103.

—, "Trajets du corps, trajets célestes: éléments d'une cosmologie mystique juive," *Moïse Géographe. Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace* (ed. A Desreumaux and F. Schmidt; ÉPP, 24; Paris, 1988) 31–49 at 45–48.

Riaud, J. "Quelques réflexions sur l'Apocalypse grecque de Baruch ou III Baruch à la lumière d'un ouvrage récent," *Semitica* 48 (1998) 89–99.

Rosenstiehl, J.-M. "La chute de l'Ange. Origines et développement d'une légende, ses attestations dans la littérature copte," *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte. Journée d'études coptes, Strasbourg 28 mai 1982* (CahBC, 1; Louvain, 1983) 37–60 at 48–49.

Šagi, J. "Li sangue di Cristo nell'Apocalisse di Baruch greca," *Li Sangue e antropologia biblica nella patristica* (Roma, 23–28 novembre 1981) (Ed. F. Vattioni; Roma, 1982) 2.769–795.

Schäfer, Peter, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin, 1975).

Schmid, H. "Baruch und die ihm zugeschriebene apokryphe und pseudepigraphische Literatur," *Judaica* 30 (1974) 54–70 at 64–67.

Schwemer, A.-M. "Gottes Hand und die Propheten. Zum Wandel der Metapher 'Hand Gottes' in frühjüdischer Zeit," *Le Main de Dieu—Die Hand Gottes* (ed. R Kieffer and J. Bergman; WUNT, 94; Tübingen, 1997) 65–85 at 77–78.

Segal, A.F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and Their Environment," *ANRW* 2.23.2 (Berlin/New York, 1981) 1334–1394 at 1365–1366.

Sokolov, M.I. (Соколов, М.И.) "Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе," *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В. И. Ламанского* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.

—, "О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4/1 (Москва, 1907) 9–10.

—, "Апокрифическое откровение Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.1 (Москва, 1907) 201–258.

Sterling, G.E. "Recherché or Representative? What is the Relationship between Philo's Treatises and Greek-Speaking Judaism?" *Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999) 1–30 at 10.

Stichel, R., "Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse," in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (eds. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 177; Göttingen, 1989) 116–128.

Turdeanu, É. "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 69 (1950) 22–52, 176–218 at 177–181.

—, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1955) 47–52 at 50–52.
—, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave," *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23–48.
—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 1–74.
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Откровение Варуха," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 282–283.
Wright, J.E. *The Cosmography of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch and Its Affinities* (Diss. Brandeis, 1992).
—, "Baruch. His Evolution from Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, PA, 1998) 264–289.
Zagrebin, B.M. (Загребин, Б.М.) "О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая," *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ* (*Исследования, обзоры, публикации*). *Сборник научных трудов* (Ленинград, 1979) 61–80.

4 Baruch

(Paraleipomena Jeremiou)

a. *Texts*

Novaković, S. (Новаковић, Ст.) *Примери књижевности и језика старога и српско-словенскога* (I. Ausgabe, Београд, 1877) 424–431; (II. Ausgabe; Београд, 1889) 427–433; (III. Ausgabe; Београд, 1904) 495–502.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) "Повесть о пленении Иерусалима" in: *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.273–284; 284–297.
—, "Повесть о пленении Иерусалима," *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 15–24.

b. *Translations*

Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) "Слово за пророк Йеремия и за поробването на Йерусалим," *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 77–84; 354–355.

c. *Research*

Delling, G. *Jüdische Lehre und Frömmigkeit in den Paralipomena Jeremiae* (Berlin, 1967).
Harris, J.R. *The Rest of the Words of Baruch* (Cambridge, 1889).
Istoki, *Истоки Русской Беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 145–147.
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Редакции Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 179.

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) "Иеремия" *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 221–227 at 223–226.

Kohler, K. "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada. B. The Second Baruch or Rather the Jeremiah Apocalypse," *JQR* 5 (1893) 407–419.

Kraft, R.A. and Purintun, A.-E. *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* (T&T 1; Pseudepigrapha Series 1; Missoula, Mont., 1972).

Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864) 95–103.

Novaković, S. "Apokrifi jednoga srpskog ćirilovskog zbornika XIV v. I. Slovo propoka Jeremije o plenjeni Jerusalima," *Starine* 8 (1876) 36–48.

Polivka, G. "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu. VI. Priča proroka Jeremije o plijenjenju Jerusalima," *Starine* 21 (1889) 221–224.

Popov, A.N. (Попов, А.Н.) *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А.И. Хлудова* (Москва, 1872) 406–413.

Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 72.

Robinson, S.E. "4 Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols. ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]) 2.413–425.

Shahmatov, A.S. and Lavrov, P. (Шахматов, А.С. и Лавров, П.) "Повесть пророка Иеремии," in: "Сборник XII века Московского Успенского собора. Вып. 1.," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 2,3 (1899). [repr., Gravenhage, 1957) 1–6.

Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский И.И.) *Древние славянские памятники юсового письма* (С.-Петербург, 1868) 185–188.

Turdeanu, É. "Les Paralipomènes de Jérémie en slave," *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 348–363; 442.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Паралипомен Иеремии," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 295–296.

Uspenskij, *Успенский сборник XII–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1971) 31–37.

Zagrebin, B.M. (Загребин, Б.М.) "О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая," *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ* (*Исследования, обзоры, публикации*). *Сборник научных трудов* (Ленинград, 1979) 64–72.

Pseudo-Danielic Fragments

a. *Texts*

Istrin V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Откровение Мефодия Патарскаго и апокрифические видения Даниила* (Москва, 1897).

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (Памятники древней письменности и искусства, 162; С.-Петербург 1906) 133–136.

Lavrov, P.A. (Лавров П.А.) "Видение Даниила," *Апокрифические Тексты* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 67:3; С.-Петербург, 1899; [repr. Nendeln, 1966]) 1–5.
Макушев, В. "О некоторых рукописях библиотеки в Белграде. II. Рукописи сербского письма," *Русский Филологический Вестник* (1882) 1–29 at 23–26.
Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский М.Н.) "Библиографические материалы," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* (1889) 58–64, 95–98.
Srećković, P.S. (Срећковић, П.С.) "Зборник попа Драгоља. Садржина и пророштва," *Споменик* 5 (1890) 10–13.
Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский И.И.) "Памятники языка и словесности, их списки, чтения и обьяснения," *Ученые записки Императорской Академии Наук 1* (С-Петербург, 1854) 135–136.
T'pkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Тъпкова-Заимова, В. и А. Милтенова) *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и средновековна България* (София, 1996).

b. *Translations*

Alexander, P.J. "Appendix: English Translation of Slavonic Daniel," *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (ed. D. de F. Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985) 65–72.
Miltenova, A. "От светите книги видение на пророк Даниил," in: Bozhilov, I., et al., eds., (Божилов, И. и Кожухаров С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987) 158–159.
Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981) 400–401, 404–405.

c. *Research*

Alexander, P.J. "Historical interpolations in the Zbornik popa Dragolia," in: *Actes du XVe congrès international des études Byzantines* (Bucureşti, 1976) 23–28.
—, "Medieval Apocalypses as Historical Sources," *American Historical Review* 73 (1968) 997–1018.
—, *The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition* (ed. D. de F. Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985) 62–64.
Bonwetsch, G.N. "Die christliche vornicänische Literatur in altslavischen Handschriften," in: A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Berlin, 1893 [Leipzig, 1958]) 1/2. 916–917.
Bousset, W. *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche* (Göttingen, 1895) 41–45 at 43.
—, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 20 (1900) 262–281, 287–290.
García Martínez, F. "4QPseudo Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo-Danielic Literature," *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden, 1992) 137–161 at 151–152.
Haelewyck, J.-C. *Clavis Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) 210–211.

Kajmakamova, M. (Каймакамова, М.) "Две старобългарски летописни съчинения от XI в.," *Исторически преглед* 5 (1976) 86–96.
Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892) 127–158 at 139.
Miltenova, A. "Апокрифи за пророк Даниил," in: *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; София, 1992) 35–36.
—, "Апокрифи за пророк Даниил," in: *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 44–45.
Petrov, P. and Gjuzelev, V. (Петров, П. и Гюзелев, В.) *Христоматия по история на България* (София, 1978) 1.443–449.
Stegmüller, F. *Repertorium biblicum Medii Aevi* (Madrid, 1950ff.) No. 17.13–15.
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Апокрифы и сказания о Данииле," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 44–47.
T'pkova-Zaimova, V. and A. Miltenova (Тъпкова-Заимова, В. и А.. Милтенова) "Виденията на пророк Даниил във Византия и в средновековна България," *Palaeobulgarica* 14.4 (1990) 39–46.

Apocalypse of Zosimus

a. *Texts*

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 2.78–92.

c. *Research*

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 43.

Ahiqar

a. *Texts*

Grigor'ev, A.D. (Григорьев, А.Д.) *Повесть об Акире Премудром. Исследование и тексты* (Москва, 1913).
Tvorogov, O., (Творогов, О.) "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.246–281.
—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.28–56.
—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Kolesov, V.V. (Колесов, В.В.) *Мудрое слово Древней Руси* (*XI–XVII вв.*) (Москва, 1989) 176–177.

b. *Translations*

Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., К. Куев и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 203–207.

Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.246–281.

—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.29–57.

c. *Research*

Barsov, E. (Барсов, Е.) "Акир премудрый во вновь открытом сербском списке XVI века," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 3 (1886) 1–11.

Chtimia, I.C. "L'Histoire du sage Ahikar dans les littératures slaves," *Romano-slavica* 9 (1963) 413–426.

Durnovo, N.N. (Дурново, Н.Н.) "К истории повести об Акире," *Материалы и исследования по старинной литературе* I (Москва, 1915).

Gaster, M. *Chrestomaţie Română. Texte Tipărite şi manuscrise [sec. XVI-XIX] dialectale şi populare, cu o introducere gramatică şi un glosar româno-francez/ Chrestomathie roumaine. Textes imprimés et manuscrits du XVI^me^ au XIX^me^ siècle; spécimens dialectals et de littérature populaire accompagnés d'une introduction, d'une grammaire et d'un glossaire roumain-français* (Leipzig/Bucureşti, 1891) 2.134–136.

Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Й.) *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935) 237–245.

Orlov, A.S. (Орлов А.С.) *Переводные повести феодальной Руси и Московского государства XII–XVII вв.* (Ленинград, 1934) 56–63.

Piotrovskaja, E.K. (Пиотровская, Е.К.) "Усть-Цилемская обработка 'Повести об Акире Премудром,'" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 31 (1976) 378–383.

—, "О русской редакции Повести об Акире Премудром," *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* (Том 10; Ленинград, 1978) 323–327.

Thompson, F.J. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anläßlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deuschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 327–387 at 346.

Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 93–94, 188, 192.

Tvorogov, O. (Творогов, О.) "Беллетристические элементы в переводном историческом повествовании XI–XIII вв.," in: *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 163–180.

—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. et al., (eds.) *Памятники литературы Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978–1992) 2.256–658.

—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмит-

рий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 243–245.
—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: O.B. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 141–142.
—, "Повесть об Акире Премудром," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.362–364.

The Word of the Blessed Zerubabel

(Слово Блаженного Зоровавеля)

a. *Texts*

Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Слово блаженного Зоровавеля," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.150–158.

b. *Translations*

Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Слово блаженного Зоровавеля," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.151–159.
—, "Слово блаженного Зоровавеля," in: Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (ed.) (Рождественская М.В.) *Апокрифы Древней Руси* (С.-Петербург, 2002) 87–94.

c. *Research*

Alekseev, A.A. (Алексеев, Анатолий) "Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века," *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75 at 62–63.
Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) "Слово блаженного Зоровавеля," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.378–380.
—, "'Слово блаженного Зоровавеля' как пример непосредственного перевода с древнееврейского оригинала," in: Navtanovich, L.M. (Навтанович, Л.М.) *Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000) 148–155.
Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский А.И.) *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1910) 400.

The Josippon

(Slavonic Translation of Josephus' *Wars*)

a. *Texts*

Flusser, D. *The Josippon [Josephus Gorionides]* (2 vols.; Jerusalem, 1978–1980).
Istrin, V. M. (Истрин, В.М.) *La Prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif* (trs. P. Pascal and A. Vaillant; 2 vols; Paris, 1934–1938).

Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский Никита Александрович) "*История Иудейской Войны*" *Иосифа Флавия в древнерусском переводе* (Москва-Ленинград, 1958) 167–467.
Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.), "*Из 'Истории Иудейской Войны' Иосифа Флавия*," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 2.254–292.
Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.), et al. (eds), "*История Иудейской Войны*" *Иосифа Флавия. Древнерусский Перевод* (2 vols.; Москва, 2004) 1.65–408.
Zeitlin, S. "The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales," *JQR* LVIII (1968) 173–203.

b. *Translations*

Berendts, A. and K. Grass, *Flavius Josephus: Vom Jüdischen Kriege, Buch I–IV* (Teil I; Dorpat, 1924–1926; Teil II; Dorpat, 1927).
Pascal, P., *La prise de Jérusalem* (Monaco, 1964).
Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.), "*Из 'Истории Иудейской Войны' Иосифа Флавия*," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 2.255–293.

c. *Research*

dell'Agata G. *Unità e varietà dello slavo ecclesiastico. A proposito di due mss. della Guerra giudaica* (Europa Orientalis, 7; Roma, 1988).
Amusin, I.D. (Амусин, И.Д.) "К вопросу о зависимости сообщения о ессеях в древнерусском переводе Флавия от 'Философумены,'" *Древний Восток и мировая культура* (Москва, 1981) 128–132.
Angelov, B.S. (Ангелов, Б.С.) "Иосиф Флавий в южнославянских литературах," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 255–261.
Berendts, A. "Analecta zum Slavischen Josephus," *ZNW* (1908) 40–70.
Bickermann, E. "Sur la version vieux-russe de Flavius Josèphe," in: E. Bickermann, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AGAJU, 9; Leiden, 1986) 3.172–195.
Conchaud, P.-L. "Les textes relatifs à Jésus dans la version slave de Josèphe," *Revue de l'Histoire de Religion* (1926).
Dujchev, I.S. (Дуйчев, И.С.) "Одно неясное место в древнерусском переводе Иосифа Флавия," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 16 (1958) 415–423.
Eisler, R. "Jésus d'après la version slave de Flavius Josephus," *Revue de l'Histoire de Religion* (1926).
Fält, E. *Compounds in Contact. A Study in Compound Words with Special Reference to the Old Slavonic Translation of Flavius Josephus*' (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Slavica Upsaliensia, 28; Uppsala, 1990).
—, *An Index to the Compound Words in Flavius Josephus' "Peri tou Ioudaikou polemou" in its Greek and Old Slavonic Versions* (Uppsala Slavic Papers, 19; Uppsala, 1990).
Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий, Н.К.) "'История Иудейской войны' в древнерусском переводе," *Старинная русская повесть. Статьи и исследования* (Москва-Ленинград, 1941) 38–47.

Hansack, E. "N.A. Meščerski, Istorija iudejskoj vojny Iosifa Flavija v drevnerusskom perevode," *Anzeiger für Slavische Philologie* 21 (1992) 183–185.

—, *Die altrussische Version des "Jüdischen Krieges." Untersuchungen zur Integration der Namen* (Heidelberg, 1999).

Istrin, V. M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Александрия русских хронографов*: *Исследования и текст* (Москва, 1893).

—, "К вопросу о взаимоотношениях Еллинских Летописцев и Архивского (Иудейского) Хронографа," *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии Наук* 16.4 (1912) 125–143.

—, "'Иудейская война' Иосифа Флавия в древнем славяно-русском переводе," *Ученые записки Высшей школы г. Одессы. Отдел гуманитарно-общественных наук. Том 2* (Одесса, 1926) 27–40.

Kennard, J.S. "Cleanings from the Slavonic Josephus Controversy," *JQR* 39 (1948) 161–170.

—, "Slavonic Josephus: A Retraction," *JQR* 39 (1948–1949) 281–283.

Kerschbaumer, G.W. *Die L-Periphrase in der altrussischen Version des "Jüdischen Krieges" von Josephus Flavius: Das echte und das fingierte Perfektpräsens* (Monumenta Linguae Slavicae Dialecti Veteris, 33; Freiburg i Br., 1993).

Makeeva I.I. (Макеева, И.И.) "Акцентная микросистема Архивского хронографа XV в. (На материале 'Истории Иудейской войны' Иосифа Флавия)," *Русский язык в научном освещении* 1 (5) (2003) 141–169.

Mead, R.S. "The Slavonic Josephus Account of the Baptist and Jesus," *The Quest* 1924.

Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский Никита Александрович) "Из наблюдений над древнерусским переводом 'Истории Иудейской войны' Иосифа Флавия," *Доклады Академии наук СССР. Серия В. Отделение общественных наук. Вып. 2* (Ленинград, 1930) 19–25.

—, "К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности Киевского периода," *Ученые записки Карело-Финского педагогического института. Т. 2. Вып. 1* (Петрозаводск, 1956) 198–219.

—, "Значение древнеславянских переводов для восстановления их архетипов (на материале древнерусского перевода "Истории Иудейской войны" Иосифа Флавия)," *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике* (Москва, 1960) 61–94.

—, "Отрывок из 'Иоссипон' в 'Повести Временных Лет,'" *Палестинский Сборник* 2/64–65 (1958) 58–68.

Mulich, M.I. (Мулич, М.И.) "Отражение 'Истории Иудейской войны' Иосифа Флавия в древней сербской литературе," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 24 (1969) 108–111.

Osinkina, L.V. (Осинкина, Л.В.) "Из наблюдений над сложными словами в языке русских переводных памятников XI–XII вв. (на материале "Истории Иудейской войны" Иосифа Флавия)," *Вестник Ленинградского университета* 8.2 (1981) 70–75.

Philonenko, M. "La notice du Josèphe slave sur les Esséniens," *Semitica* 6 (1956) 69–73.

Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) "Древнерусский перевод 'Истории Иудейской войны' Иосифа Флавия," *Вестник РГНФ* 1 (1996) 227–234.

—, "*Из 'Истории Иудейской Войны' Иосифа Флавия*," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.)

(Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 2.535–538.
Rubinstein, A. "Observation on the Old Russian Version of Josephus' *Wars*," *JSS* 2 (1957) 329–348.
—, "The Essenes According to the Slavonic Version of Josephus' Wars," *VT* 6 (1956) 307–308.
Trost, K. at al., *Die Lexik der altrussischen Version des "Jüdischen Krieges" des Flavius Josephus* (3 vols.; 1990–1991).
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "История Иудейской Войны Иосифа Флавия," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 214–215.
Vaillant, A. "Le Josèphe slave et les Esséniens," *Semitica* 8 (1958) 39–40.
Zeitlin, S. "The Hoax of the 'Slavonic Josephus,'" *JQR* 39 (1948) 171–180.
—, "The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales," *JQR* LVIII (1968) 173–203.
—, *Josephus on Jesus; with Particular Reference to the Slavonic Josephus and the Hebrew Josippon* (Philadelphia, 1931).

Palaea Historica

(Историческая Палея)

a. *Texts*

Popov, A. (Попов, А.) *Книга бытия небеси и земли* (*Палея историческая*) *с приложением сокращенной палеи русской редакции* (Москва, 1881).
Vassiliev, A., *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893).

c. *Research*

Flusser, D. "Palaea Historica—An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends", *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem, 1971) 48–79.
Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский, М.Н.) *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 104–147.
—, "Югославянские тексты Исторической палеи и русские её тексты," in: M.N. Speranskij, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960) 115–116.
Stankov, R. A. (Станков, Р.А.) *Древнерусская и народная лексика в языке Исторической палеи* (Ph.D. Diss.; Москва, 1985).
—, "Историческая палея—памятник болгарской культуры," *Palaeobulgarica-Старобългаристика* 4 (1986) 55–63.
—, "Локализация древнеболгарских переводных текстов в свете так называемой 'охридской' и 'преславской лексики' (На материале Исторической Палеи)," *Старобългаристика* 4 (1991) 83–91.
Sumnikova, T.A. (Сумникова, Т.А.) "К проблеме перевода Исторической Палеи," *Изучение русского языка и источниковедение* (Москва, 1969) 27–39.

Turdeanu, É. "La Palaea Byzantine chez les slaves du Sud et chez les Roumains," *RESI* 40 (1964) 195–206.
—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden, 1981) 392–403.
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О. В.) "Палея историческая," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.160–161.
—, "Палеи," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.

Explanatory Palaea

(Толковая Палея)

a. *Texts*

Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов А.М.) "Палея Толковая,'" in: *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; С.-Петербург, 1999) 571–650.
—, "Палея Толковая,'" in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 114–147.
Paleja Tolkovaja, *Палея Толковая по списку, сделанному в Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (Вып. 1–2; М., 1892–1896).
Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893).

b. *Translations*

Kamchatnov, A.M. (Камчатнов А.М.) "Палея Толковая,'" in: *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; С.-Петербург, 1999) 651–677.
—, "Палея Толковая,'" in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 147–169.

c. *Research*

Adrianova, V.P. (Адрианова, В.П.) *К литературной истории Толковой Палеи* (Киев, 1910).
Barankova, G.S. (Баранкова, Г.С.) "О взаимоотношениях 'Шестоднева' Иоанна экзарха Болгарского и 'Толковой палеи,'" *История русского языка: Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1982) 262–277.
Borcova, I.V. (Борцова, И.В.) "Легендарные экскурсы о разделении земли в древнерусской литературе," *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР* (Москва, 1989) 178–185.
Gricaj, M.S. (Грицай, М.С.) "Апокрифи та їх роль у розвитку української

лїтератури (На допомогу студентові-заочнику)," *Українська мова і лїтература в школі* 8 (1975) 27–33.
Istomin, K.K. (Истомин, К.К.) "К вопросу о редакциях Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/1 (1905) 147–184.
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) *Замечания о составе Толковой Палеи* (вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1897).
—, "Редакции Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 150–151.
Karneev, A. (Карнеев, А.) "К вопросу о взаимных отношениях Толковой Палеи и Златой Матицы," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 2 (1900) 344.
L'vov, A.S. (Львов, А.С.) "Чешско-моравская лексика в памятниках древнерусской письменности," *Славянское языкознание* (Москва, 1968) 316–338.
Maksimovich, K.A. (Максимович, К.А.) "Птица феникс в древнерусской литературе (К интерпретации образа)," *Герменевтика древнерусской литературы* (Сб. 5; Москва, 1992) 316–334.
Mihajlov, A.V. (Михайлов, А.В.) "Общий обзор состава, источников, редакций и литературных источников Толковой Палеи," *Варшавские университетские известия* 7 (1895) 1–21.
—, "К вопросу о тексте Бытие пророка Моисея в Толковой Палее," *Варшавские университетские известия* 1 (1896) 1–23.
—, "К вопросу о происхождении и источниках Толковой Палеи," *Известия по Русскому Языку и Словесности* 1 (1928) 49–80.
Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков, В.В.) "Религиозно-философское значение 'Палеи Толковой,'" in: *Философские и богословские идеи в памятниках древнерусской мысли* (eds. М.Н. Громов и В.В. Мильков; Москва, 2000) 108–113.
Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф "Заветы двенадцати патриархов" в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).
Piljavec, L.B. (Пилявец, Л.Б.) "'Зерцало богословия' Кирилла Транквиллиона-Старовецкого и 'Палея Толковая,'" *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья* (Киев, 1988) 245–250.
Piotrovskaja, E.K. (Пиотровская, Е.К.) "Древнерусская версия 'Христианской Топографии' Козьмы Индикоплова и 'Толковая Палея,'" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 33 (1993) 138–142.
Rystenko, A.V. (Рыстенко, А.В.) *Материалы для культурной истории Толковой Палеи* (С.-Петербург, 1908).
Scheglov, A.P. (Щеглов, А.П.) *Философское содержание "Толковой Палеи" по материалам русских летописей* (Ph.D. Diss, Москва, 1994).
—, "Комментарии к Толковой Палеи," *Волшебная Гора: Философия, эзотеризм, культурология* (т. 7; Москва, 1998) 225–226.
Shahmatov, A.A. (Шахматов, А.А.) "Толковая Палея и русская летопись," in: Shahmatov, A.A. *Статьи по славяноведению* (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1904) 199–272.
Slavova, T. (Славова, Т.) "За протографа на Тълковната Палея," *Palaeobulgarica* 3 (1991) 64–66.
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Палея Толковая," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.)

(Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 285–288.
—, "Палеи," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.
Uspenskij, V.M. (Успенский, В.М.) *Толковая Палея* (Казань, 1876).
Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) "О Толковой Палее, Златой Матице и 'естественно научных' компиляциях," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 80–90.
—, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000).
—, "Пророчество Соломона и Толковая Палея," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 42 (2001) 518–539.
Zhdanov, I.N. (Жданов, И.Н.) "Палея," *Университетские известия* 9 (1881) 255.

Palaea Chronographica

(Хронографическая Палея)

a. *Texts*

Istrin, V.M. (Истрин В.М.) *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славянорусском переводе* (3 vols.; Петроград, 1920–1930) 2.109–113.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877) 204–208, 221–241.
Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин Александр Николаевич) *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]) 9–10, 20–21, 24–49, 51–58.
Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Николай Саввич) *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]) 1.17–18, 24–25, 254–258.
Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893).

c. *Research*

Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) "Этикетный мотив в древнерусской миниатюре XV в.," *Исследования по древней и новой литературе* (Ленинград, 1987) 25–31.
Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А. Я.) "К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе," *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин, В.М.) "Редакции Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 135–203; 11/1 (1906) 1–43.

Karinskij, N. (Каринский, Н.) *Язык Пскова и его области в XV веке* (С.-Петербург, 1909) 1–62.

Kloss, B.M. (Клосс, Б.М.) "К вопросу о происхождении Еллинского летописца второго вида," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 370–379.

Kotljar, N.F. (Котляр, Н.Ф.) "Грузинские сюжеты древнерусских летописей," *Из истории украинско-грузинских связей* (Вып. 3; ed. Г.Г. Пайчадзе; Тбилиси, 1975) 7–19.

Maslennikova, N.N. (Масленникова, Н.Н.) *Присоединение Пскова к Русскому централизованному государству* (Ленинград, 1955) 164–165.

Popov, A.N. (Попов А.Н.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869).

Protas'eva, T.N. (Протасьева, Т.Н.) "Псковская Палея 1477 года," *Древнерусское искусство*: *Художественная культура Пскова* (Москва, 1968) 97–108.

Rybakov, B.A. (Рыбаков, Б.А.) "Окна в исчезнувший мир," *Доклады и сообщения исторического факультета МГУ* (Вып. 4; Москва, 1946) 50–51.

Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов, О.В.) "Повесть временных лет и Хронограф по великому изложению," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 28 (1974) 99–113.

—, *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975), chapters 2, 3, 5.

—, "Палея хронографическая," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.161–162.

—, "Палеи," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 124–125.

Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси* (*на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков*) (München, 2000).

II

RELATED STUDIES

1. *Jewish Pseudepigraphical Works and Traditions in Slavic Milieux*

Adamczyk, Maria, *Biblijno-apokryficzne narracje w literatureze staropolskiej do końca XVI wieku* (Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu; Filologia Polska, 19; Poznan, 1980).

Adrianova-Peretc V.P. (Адрианова-Перетц В.П.) "Апокрифы," in: *История русской литературы* (Т. 1. М.—Л., 1941) 71–86.

—, *Древнерусская литература и фольклор* (Ленинград, 1974).

Afanas'ev, A.N. (Афанасьев, А.Н.) *Народные русские легенды* (Москва, 1859).

—, *Поэтические воззрения славян на природу* (Т. 3. Москва, 1869).

Alekseev, A. (Алексеев Анатолий) *Песнь песней в древней славяно-русской письменности* (Часть 1 и 2; Москва, 1980).

—, "Песнь песней по русскому списку 16 века в переводе с древнееврейского оригинала," *Палестинский Сборник* 27 (1981) 63–79.

—, "О греческой основе славянских библейских переводов," *Starobulgaristica* 8 (1984) 3–22.

—, "Цитаты из Песни песней в славянской письменности (цитаты и текстология)," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 74–92.

—, "Der Stellewert der Textologie bei der Erforschung altkirchenslavischer Übersetzungstexte," *Die Welt der Slaven* 31.2 (1986) 415–438.

—, "Переводы с древнееврейских оригиналов в Древней Руси," *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987) 1–20.

—, "Пути стабилизации языковой нормы в России 11–16 вв.," *Вопросы Языкознания* 2 (1987) 34–46.

—, "К истории русской переводческой школы XII в.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 41 (1988) 154–196.

—, "Цели и методы текстологического исследования лингвистических источников 11–17 вв.," *Русистика Сегодня. Язык: Система и её функционирование* (Москва, 1988) 188–209.

—, "Русско-еврейские литературные связи до XV века," *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75.

—, "The Song of Songs in the Slavonic Bible," *The Bible Translator* 47 (1996) 119–125.

—, "Кое-что о переводах в Древней Руси (по поводу статьи Фр. Дж. Томсона 'Made in Russia')," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 49 (1996) 278–295.

—, "По поводу статьи Г.Г. Ланта 'Ещё раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси,'" *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 442–445.

—, *Текстология славянской Библии* (С.-Петербург, 1999).
—, "К вопросу об изучении переводной письменности Киевского периода," in: *Русская историческая филология*: *Проблемы и перспективы* (Петрозаводск, 2001) 34–42.
Altbauer, M. *The "Vilnius" Version of the Oldest Russian Translation of the Book of Esther (Vilnius Codex 52)* (Jerusalem, 1988).
Altbauer, M. and M. Taube, "The Slavonic Book of Esther: When, Where and from What Language Was It Translated?" *Harvard Ukranian Studies* 8 (1984) 304–320.
Angelov, B. (Ангелов, Б.) "Есхатологическите представи на средновековния българин, отразени в официалната и апокрифната литература," *Palaeobulgarica* 3 (1982) 73–97.
Angusheva-Tihanova, A. (Ангушева-Тиханова, А.) *Гадателните книги в старобългарската литература* (София, 1996).
Apocrifna Khizhnina, "Апокрифна книжнина," in: Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., Куев К. и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 110–144.
Arhangel'skij, A.S. (Архангельский А.С.) "К истории южнославянской и древнерусской апокрифической литературы," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4.1 (1899) 112–118.
Astahova, A.M. (Астахова А.М.) "Проблема взаимовлияния устной и книжной традиций у славянских народов," *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению. IV Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1959) 288–291.
Barac, G.M. (Барац Г.М.) *Собрание трудов по вопросу о еврейском элементе в памятниках древнерусской письменности* (1–2; Париж, 1927).
Barsov, E. (Барсов Е.) "О воздействии апокрифов на обряд и иконопись," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 12 (1885) 100–110.
Batjushkov, F. (Батюшков, Ф.) *Спор души с телом в памятниках средневековой литературы* (Вып. 1–2; Харьков, 1890–1892).
Beljaev, M.V. (Беляев М.В.) "Происхождение народных легенд о миротворении," *Известия Азербайджанского государственного ун-та. Общественные науки* 4–5 (1925) 66–74.
—, "Из литературной истории русских народно-поэтических представлений," *Известия Азербайджанского государственного ун-та. Общественные науки* 6–7 (1926) 49–61.
Belobrova, O.A. (Белоброва, О.А.) "Переводная беллетристика XI–XIII вв.," *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970) 143–154.
Benovska-S'bkova, M. (Беновска-Събкова, М.) "Апокрифни мотиви и народно вярване (Распускането на мъртвите души)," *Българска етнология* 3 (1996) 80–89.
Bobrik, M.A. (Бобрик, М.А.) "'Закон Моисеев' из Новгородского кодекса: Материалы к комментарию," *Russian Linguistics* 28 (2004) 43–71.
Bobrov, A.G. (Бобров, А.Г.) *Апокрифическое Сказание Афродитиана в литературе и книжности Древней Руси. Исследования и тексты* (С.-Петербург, 1994).
Bogdanović, D. (Богдановић, Д.) *Историја старе српске књижевности* (Београд, 1980).

Bogolubov, A.N. (Боголюбов, А.Н.) *Естественнонаучные представления Древней Руси* (Москва, 1978).

Borisov, A. Ja. (Борисов, А. Я.) "К вопросу о восточных элементах в древнерусской литературе," *Палестинский Сборник* 29/92 (1987) 154–167.

Bozhilov, I., et al., eds., (Божилов, И. и Кожухаров С.) *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII в.* (София, 1987).

Brojer, G. (Бройер Г.) "Значение синтаксических наблюдений для определения оригиналов древнерусской переводной письменности," in: *IV Международный съезд славистов. Материалы дискуссии* (Москва, 1962) 2.248–250.

Bulanin, D.M. (Буланин, Д.М.) *Античные традиции в древнерусской литературе XI–XVI вв.* (München, 1991).

Bulashev, G.F. (Булашев Г.Ф.) *Украинский народ в своих легендах, религиозных воззрениях и верованиях. Вып. 1. Космогонические украинские народные воззрения и верования* (Киев, 1909). [Repr.: Булашев Г. *Український народ у своїх легендах, релігійних поглядах та віруваннях. Космогонічні українські народні погляди та вірування* (Киев, 1993)].

Buslaev, F.I. (Буслаев Ф.И.) "Мифические предания о человеке и природе," in: Ф.И. Буслаев, *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1 и 2; С.-Петербург, 1861) 1.137–151.

—, "Изображение страшного суда по русским подлинникам," in: Ф.И. Буслаев, *Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства* (Т. 1 и 2; С.-Петербург, 1861) 2.133–154.

Chistov, K.V. (Чистов, К.В.) *Русские народные социально-утопические легенды XVII–XIX вв.* (Москва, 1967).

Demin, A.S. (Демин, А.С.) *Древнерусская литература: Изображение природы и человека* (Москва, 1996).

Demkova, N.S. and Semjakina, Z.P. (Демкова, Н.С. и Семякина, З.П.) "'Повесть об ангеле ослушавшемся Бога' (Из истории русской повести конца XVII начала XVIII в.)," in: *Русская литература на рубеже двух эпох* (XVII—начало XVIII в.) (Москва, 1971) 128–159.

Dergacheva, I.V. (Дергачева, И.В.) *Посмертная судьба и иной мир в древнерусской книжности* (Москва, 2004).

Dimitrova, D. (Димитрова, Д.) "Темата на произхода на злото в старобългарската апокрифна традиция," in: *Литература, общество, идеи* (София, 1986) 25–47.

Dragomanov, M. (Драгоманов М.) "Забележки върху славянските религиозно-етически легенди," *Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина 8* (София, 1892) 276–281.

Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) "Apocrypha Bysantino-Slavica," *Zbornik Filosovskog fakulteta (Beograd)* 9/1 (1967) 247–250.

Eliseev, G.A. (Елисеев Г.А.) "Антиеврейские православные сочинения конца XV—начала XVI века и влияние на них древнееврейских апокрифических книг," *Исследование по источниковедению истории России (до 1917 года). Сборник статей* (Москва, 1996) 75–97.

—, "Две системы взглядов в общественном сознании средневековой Руси и эволюция апокрифов в XIII–XV вв.," *Русское Средневековье. Книжная Культура* (вып. 1; Москва, 1998) 26–58.

Elizarova, M.M. (Елизарова М.М.) "Ветхозаветная апокрифическая литература и кумранские находки," *Палестинский Сборник* 28.91 (1986) 62–68.

Eremin, I.P. (Еремин И.П.) "Исследование формы древнерусских произведений," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 12 (1956) 284–291.

—, "О византийском влиянии в болгарской и древнерусской литературах IX–XII вв.," *Славянские литературы: V Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1963) 5–13.

Evseev, I.E. (Евсеев И.Е.) *Заметки по древнеславянскому переводу Священного Писания: Толкования на книгу пророка Даниила в древнеславянской и старорусской письменности* (Москва, 1901).

—, *Книга пророка Даниила в древне-славянском переводе* (С.-Петербург, 1905).

—, "Словеса святых пророк—противоиудейский памятник по рукописи XV века," in: *Древности: Труды Славянской комиссии Императорского московского археологического общества, том 4.1* (Москва, 1907).

Fasmer, M.G. (Фасмер, М.Г.) *Греко-славянские этюды. III. Греческие заимствования в русском языке* (С.-Петербург, 1909).

Gaster, M. *Ilchester Lectures on Greeko-Slavonic Literature (and its Relation to the Folklore of Europe during the Middle Ages)* (London, 1887).

Gavrjuschin, N.K. (Гаврюшин Н.К.) "'Поновление стихий' в древнерусской книжности," *Отечественная общественная мысль эпохи средневековья (историко-философские очерки). Сборник Научных Трудов* (ed. В.С. Горский; Киев, 1988) 206–214.

Generozov Ja. (Генерозов Я.) *Русские народные представления о загробной жизни на основании закличек, причитаний, духовных стихов и т. п.* (Саратов, 1883).

Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изостреи борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 76–161.

Georgieva, I. (Георгиева, И.) *Българска народна митология* (София, 1983).

Gorodcov, P.A. (Городцов П.А.) "Западносибирские народные легенды о творении мира и борьбе духов," *Этнографическое Обозрение* 80.1 (1909) 52.

Grabar, B. "Apokrifna djela apostolska u hrvatskaglagoljskoj literature," *Radovi staroslavenskog institute (Zagreb)* 6 (1967) 109–208.

—, "Apokrifi u hrvatskoj srednejovekovnoj književnosti," *Croatica* 1 (1970) 15–28.

Gromov, M.N. (Громов М.Н.) "'Элементы мироздания' в апокрифической литературе," *Идейные течения древнерусской мысли* (С.-Петербург, 1999) 63–67.

Gudzij, N.K. (Гудзий Н.К.) "Апокрифы," in: *История древней русской литературы* (7 изд.; Москва, 1966) 28–35.

Hachaturjan, V.M. (Хачатурян В.М.) *Русские редакции эсхатологических апокрифов (конец XV–XVII вв.)* (Ph.D. Diss.; Москва, 1982).

Hubanchev, A. (Хубанчев, А.) "Религиозно-философски космогонически възгледи в апокрифната книжнина на средновековна България," *Духовна Култура* 5–6 (1967) 40–49.

Iglói, Endre, *История древней русской литературы* (Budapest, 1981) 20–29.

Illarion, Ivan Ohijenko, "Die Hebraismen in der altkirchenslavischen biblischen Sprache," *Münchener Beiträge zur Slavenkunde* 41 (1953) 163–178.
Istoki, *Истоки русской беллетристики* (Ленинград, 1970).
Istrin, V.M. (Истрин В.М.) "Новый сборник ветхозаветных апокрифов," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 1 (1848) 114–129.
—, *Александрия русских хронографов* (Москва, 1893).
—, *Первая книга хроники Иоана Малалы* (С.-Петербург, 1897).
—, *Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифические видения Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературах*: *Исследования и тексты* (Москва, 1897).
—, "Из области древне-русской литературы," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 351 (Февраль 1904) 257–294.
—, *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнем славяно-русском переводе* (3 vols.; Петроград, 1920–1930).
—, "Апокрифы," in: Istrin, V.M. (Истрин В.М.) *Очерк истории древнерусской литературы домосковского периода* (*11–13 вв.*) (Петроград, 1922) 112–117.
—, "Откровение Мефодия Патарского и летопись," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 20 (1925) 380–382.
Ivanov, J. (Иванов, Йордан) *Богомилски книги и легенди* (София, 1925[1970]).
—, *Български старини из Македония* (София, 1931[1970]).
—, *Старобългарски разкази. Текстове, новобългарски преводъ и бележки* (София, 1935).
Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.) *Из славянских рукописей. Тексты и заметки* (Учёные записки Императорского Московского университета, отд. ист.-филол., 24; Москва, 1899).
—, *Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв.* (С-Петербург, 1906).
—, "Из истории апокрифов и легенд в южнославянской письменности," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.2 (1909) 267–322; 14.3 (1909) 103–159; 15.1 (1910) 1–62; 18.3 (1913) 1–102; 18.4 (1913) 16–126.
—, *История южных славян* (Варшава, 1913).
—, *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915). [Review: Е.К. Карский, "А. Я. Яцимирский, *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915)," *РФБ* 73.1–2 (1915) 444–445.]
Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) "Novi prilozi za literaturnu biblijskih apokrifa," *Starine* 5 (1873) 69–108.
—, "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko južnoslovanskih rukopisa," *Starine* 6 (1874) 60–156.
—, *Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen. 1. Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches* (Wien, 1893).
Janchuk, N. (Янчук, Н.) "К вопросу об отражении апокрифов в народном творчестве," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 12.1 (1907) 125–143.
Kagan-Tarkovskaja, M.D. (Каган-Тарковская, М.Д.) "Энциклопедические сборники XV в. и круг интересов книгописца Кирилло-Белозерского

монастыря Ефросина," *Русская и грузинская средневековые литературы* (Ленинград, 1979) 192–199.
Kalitovskij, O. (Калитовский, О.) *Материалы до русской литературы апокрифичной* (Львов, 1884).
Karskij E.F. (Карский Е.Ф.) *Русская Правда по древнейшему списку* (Ленинград, 1930).
Kashanin, M. (Кашанин, М.) *Српска књижевност у средњем веку* (Београд, 1975).
Kazakova, N.A., Lur'e Ja. S. (Казакова Н.А. и Лурье Я.С.) *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV – начала XVI вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1955).
Kerenskij, F. (Керенский Ф.) "Древнерусские отречённые верования и календарь Брюса," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 3 (1874) 52–79; 4 (1874) 276–342.
Klejn, I. "'Слово о полку Игореве' и апокалиптическая литература (К постановке вопроса о топике древнерусской литературы," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 31 (1976) 104–105.
Korobka, N. (Коробка Н.) "Образ птицы, творящей мир, в русской народной поэзии и письменности," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 14.4 (1909) 191–192.
Krasnosel'cev, N.F. (Красносельцев, Н.Ф.) "'Прение Панагиота с Азимитом' по новым греческим спискам," *Летопись историко-филологического общества* 6 (1896) 293–364.
Kristanov, C. and Dujchev, I. (Кристанов, Ц. и Дуйчев, И.) *Естествознанието в средневековна България* (София, 1954) 204–211.
Kuznecova, V.S. (Кузнецова В.С.) *Дуалистические легенды о сотворении мира в восточнославянской фольклорной традиции* (Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук; М., 1995).
Lavrovskij, N.A. (Лавровский Н.А.) *Обозрение ветхозаветных апокрифов* (Харьков, 1864).
Lebedeva, I.N. (Лебедева, И.Н.) *Повесть о Варлааме и Иоасафе*: *Памятник древнерусской переводной литературы XI–XII вв.* (Ленинград, 1985).
Lekov, D. (Леков, Д.) *Българската литература и народното творчество* (София, 1977).
Lemming, H. "Early Slavonic Translation Technique: A Contrast with Latin and Gothic," *KMS* 4 (1987) 180–191.
Levshun, L.V. (Левшун, Л.В.) "Апокрифы," *Очерки истории восточнославянской средневековой книжности*: *Эволюция творческих методов* (Минск, 2000) 68–72.
Lihachev, D.S. (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич) *Текстология на материале русской литературы X–XVII вв.* (Москва-Ленинград, 1962).
—, *Развитие русской литературы X–XVII веков. Эпохи и стили.* (Ленинград, 1973).
—, *Поэтика древнерусской литературы* (3 изд.; Москва, 1979).
—, *Литература—Реальность—Литература* (Ленинград, 1984).
—, "Священная история в познавательных произведениях литературы Древней Руси," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси* (20 томов; С.-Петербург, 1999) 3.5–8.

Lipschic, E. Je. "Какое значение имели старославянские переводы с греческого в формулировании древнеславянских литератур?" *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению* (Москва, 1958).
Lüdke W., "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31 (1911) 218–235.
Lunt, H.G. "The Old Church Slavonic Song of Songs: One Translation or Two?" *Die Welt der Slaven* 302 (1985) 297–304.
—, "On interpreting the Russian Primary Chronicle: The Entry for 1037," *The Slavic and East European Journal* 32 (1988) 251–264.
—, "Did Jaroslav the Wise Sponsor Translations into Slavonic?" in: *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujcev* (Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia, 1; Sofia, 1988).
—, "Еще раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 51 (1999) 435–441.
Lunt, H.G. and M. Taube, "Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew?" *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988) 147–187.
—, "The Slavonic Book of Esther: Translation from Hebrew or Evidence for a Lost Greek Text?" *HTR* 87 (1994) 347–362.
—, *The Slavonic Book of Esther* (Massachusets, 1998).
Lur'e Ja. S. (Лурье, Я.С.) *Общерусские летописи XIV–XV вв.* (Ленинград, 1976) 204–209.
Majkov, L. (Майков Л.) *Великорусские заклинания* (С-Петербург, 1869).
Maljek, Je. (Малэк, Э.) "Образы ангелов в древнерусской письменности (ангелы грозные, тихие и милостивые)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 54 (2003) 201–210.
Markovski I. (Марковски, И.), "Ветхозаветни апокрифи и псевдоепиграфи," *Годишник Соф. Унив. Богословский фак.* 15 (1937/1938) 51–53.
Meshcherskaja, E.N. (Мещерская Е.Н.) et al., "Апокрифы," *Православная энциклопедия* (Москва, 2001) 3.46–58.
Meshcherskij, N.A. (Мещерский Никита Александрович) *Древнерусский перевод еврейской книги "Есфирь" и проблема переводов с еврейского в древнерусской письменности Киевского периода* (Диссертация кандидата наук; Ленинград, 1946).
—, "К вопросу изучения переводной письменности Киевского периода," *Ученые записки Карельского педагогического института* 2.1 (1956) 198–219.
—, "Отрывок из 'Иосиппон' в Повести Временных Лет," *Палестинский Сборник* 2/64–65 (1956) 58–68.
—, "К вопросу об источниках Повести Временных Лет," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 13 (1957) 57–65.
—, "Искусство перевода Киевской Руси," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 15 (1958) 54–72.
—, "К вопросу о заимствованиях из греческого в словарном составе древнерусского литературного языка (По материалам переводных произведений Киевского периода)," *Византийский Временник* 13 (1958) 246–266.
—, "О синтаксисе древних славяно-русских переводных произведений," *Теория и практика перевода* (Ленинград, 1962) 83–103.
—, "Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964) 198–231.

—, "К изучению ранней московской письменности," *Изучение русского языка. Источниковедение* (Москва, 1969) 93–103.
—, "К вопросу об источниках Изборника 1076 г.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 27 (1972) 321–328.
—, "К изучению исторической лексики 'Изборника 1076 г.'" *Русская историческая лексикология и лексикография* (Ленинград, 1972) 3–12.
—, "Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы," *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976) 181–210.
—, *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской переводной письменности IX–XV веков* (Ленинград, 1978).
—, "Текст древнерусского перевода книги Есфирь," *Dissertationes slavicae* 13 (1978) 131–164.
—, "О лингвистическом разграничении памятников древнеславянского языка русского извода и древнерусского литературного языка XI–XIV веков (к постановке проблемы)," *Проблемы развития языка* (Саратов, 1981) 3–11.
—, *Избранные статьи* (С.-Петербург, 1995).
Mezier, A.V. *Русская словесность с XI по XIX столетия включительно* (С.-Петербург, 1899) 1.74–80.
Mihajlov, A.V. (Михайлов А.В.) *Опыт изучения текста Книги Бытия пророка Моисея в древнеславянском переводе* (Варшава, 1912).
Mihajlov, N. (Михайлов Н.) "К реконструкции отдельных космогонических/космологических и "антропологических" фрагментов славянской модели мира на материале русских заговоров," *Исследования по славянскому фольклору и народной культуре. Studies in Slavic Folklore and Folk Culture* (eds. А. Архипов и И. Полинская; Вып. 2. Oakland: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1997) 57–76.
Miltenova, A. (Милтенова, Анисава) *Към характеристиката на българската литература* XV–XVII век (*сборници със смесено съдържание*) (Ph.D. Diss.; София, 1982).
—, "Неофициалната книжнина през XIII век в контекста на идейните и литературните тенденции на епохата," *Търновска книжовна школа. 4. Културно развитие на българската държава краят на XII–XIV век* (София, 1985) 102–114.
—, "Апокрифни произведения в манастирските сборници. (Постановка на въпроса)," *Кирило-Методиевски студии. 3.* (София, 1986) 262–275.
—, "Сказание о происхождении русалок. (К истории книжной деятельности книгописца XV в. Ефросина)," *Исследования по древней и новой литературе. Сборник, посвященный 80-летия Д.С. Лихачева* (Ленинград, 1987) 147–154.
—, "Апокрифни пророчества в средновековната българска литература (XI–XIII в.)," *Втори международен конгрес по българистика. Стара българска литература. Литература на българското Възраждане. Доклади* (София, 1987) 265–284.
—, "Новооткрит 'близнак' на Беляковския апокрифен сборник," *Palaeobulgarica* 8.3 (1989) 61–74.

—, "Цикълът от историко-апокалиптични творби в Драголовия сборник—произход, източници, композиция," *Старобългарска литература* 25–26 (1991) 135–144.
—, "'Видение на пророк Исайя за последните времена'—историко-апокалиптично съчинение от XIII век," *Palaeobulgarica* 16.2 (1992) 77–81.
—, *Старабългарска литература. Т. 5. Естествознание* (София, 1992).
—, "'Слово за Антихриста'—един малко познат български апокриф," *Palaeobulgarica* 17.4 (1993) 59–71.
—, "'Беседа на тримата светители' в южнославянската ръкописна традиция. Бележки върху класификацията на преписите," *Възрожденският текст. Прочити на литературата и културата на българското Възраждане. В чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Дочо Леков* (София, 1998) 336–344.
—, "Medieval Apocalyptic Texts in the Context of Bulgarian Cultural Anthropology," *Balkanistica (Special Millennial Issue. Published for the SEESA in USA)* 13 (2000) 105–112.
—, "Към въпроса гръцките прототипи на т. нар. 'Беседа на тримата светители,'" ΠΟΛΥΧΡΟΝΙΑ. *Сборник в чест на проф. Иван Божилов* (София, 2002) 212–229.
—, "Апокрифи и апокрифни цикли с вероятен български произход в руските чети-сборници от XVI–XVII в.," *Slavia Orthodoxa. Език и култура. Сборник в чест на проф. дфн Румяна Павлова* (София, 2003) 244–260.
—, *Средновековните историко-апокалиптични съчинения във византийската и в старата българска книжнина* (forthcoming).
—, *The Apocryphal Series about Abraham (в сборник в чест на проф. Ч. Грибъл*), (forthcoming).
Miltenova, A. and M. Kajmakamova (Милтенова, А. и М. Каймакамова) "Неизвестно старобългарско летописно съчинение от XI век (Сказание Исаево)," *Palaeobulgarica* 7.4 (1983) 52–73.
Miltenova, A. and Kirilova, A. (Милтенова А. и Кирилова А.) *Средновековни лековници и амулети* (София, 1994).
Miltenova, A. and Petkanova, L. (Милтенова А. и Петканова, Д.) *Старобългарска есхатология. Антология*. (София, 1993).
Miltenova, A. and T'pkova-Zaimova, V. (Милтенова А. и Тъпкова-Заимова В.) "'Пророчествата' във византийската и в старобългарската книжнинал," *Palaeobulgarica* 8.3 (1984) 23–32.
—, "The Problem of Prophecies in Byzantine and Bulgarian literature," *Balkan Studies* 25, (1984) 499–510.
—, *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и в средновековна България* (София, 1996).
Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) "Античное учение о четырех стихиях в древнерусской письменности," *Древняя Русь*: *Пересечение традиций* (Москва, 1997) 57–66.
—, *Древнерусские апокрифы* (С.-Петербург, 1999).
Mochul'skij, V.N. (Мочульский В. Н.) *Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге* (Русский Филологический Вестник, 4; Варшава, 1887).
—, *О мнимом дуализме в мифологии славян* (Варшава, 1889).

—, *Апокрифический элемент в вопросах и ответах св. Афанасия к кн. Антиоху* (Одесса, 1900).
—, *Следы народной Библии в славянской и древне-русской письменности* (Одесса, 1893).
—, *Апокрифическое сказание о создании мира* (Одесса, 1896).
Moldovan, A.M. (Молдован, А.М.) "Критерии локализации древнерусских переводов," *Славяноведение* 2 (1994) 69–80.
—, *Лексика древнеславянского перевода в региональном аспекте* (Москва, 1994).
Naumov, A.E. *Apokryfy w systemie literatury cerkiewnosłowianskiej* (Prace Komisji Slowianoznawstwa PAN w Krakowie, 36; Wrocław, 1976).
—, "Апокрифите в системата на старите славянски литератури," *Palaeobulgarica* 4.2 (1980) 71–78.
—, *Biblia w strukturze artystycznej utworow cerkiewnosłowianskich* (Krakow, 1983).
Nechunaeva, N.A. (Нечунаева, Н.А.) *Минея как тип славяно-греческого средневекового текста* (Tallinn, 2000).
Nikolov, E. (Николов, Е.) *Апокрифна литература* (София, 1948).
Panajotov, V.B. (Панайотов, В.Б.) *Апокриф "Заветы двенадцати патриархов" в контексте Толковой Палеи* (Москва, 1986).
Peretc, V.N. (Перетц, В.Н.) *Материалы по истории апокрифа и легенды. К истории Громника и Лунника* (2 тома; С.-Петербург, 1899–1901).
—, "К вопросу о еврейско-русском литературном общении," *Slavia* 5 (1926) 267–276.
Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Донка) (Петканова-Тотева, Донка) "Apokryphen 4. Die Apokryphen in der byzantino-slavische Welt," in: *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (Berlin, 1976) 1.662–666.
—, "Фолклорът в апокрифните молитви," *Български фолклор* 2 (1976) 28–40.
—, "Близости между апокрифи и фолклор," *Българската литература и народното творчество* (ed. Д. Леков; София, 1977).
—, *Апокрифна литература и фолклор. Апокрифната художествена проза и фолклорът* (София, 1978).
—, "Апокрифна художествена проза. Видова класификация и характеристика," *Старобългарска литература* 3 (1978) 13–33.
—, "Folklore und Literatur während des Mittelalters in der byzantinisch-slavischen Welt," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 15 (1979) 89–97.
—, "Апокрифната литература и личното творчество на старобългарските писатели," *Starobulgaristica* 5/3 (1981) 3–9.
—, "Апокрифната литература в България," in: Petkanova, D. (ed.) (Петканова Донка) *Апокрифи* (Стара българска литература, 1; София, 1981).
—, "Красивото в апокрифите," in: П. Динеков, *Литературознание и фолклористика* (София, 1983) 48–52.
—, "Гадательные книги и фолклорът," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985) 47–57.
—, *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992).
—, *Приемственост и развитие* (София, 1992).
—, "Апокрифна литература," in: Д. Петканова, *Старобългарска литература: Енциклопедичен Речник* (София, 1992) 36–39.

—, "Отново по въпроса апокрифи и фолклор," *ЕЛ* 4 (1992) 124–138.
—, *Старобългарска литература IX–XVIII век* (3 ed., София, 1997) 231–275.
—, *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (Велико Търново, 2003).
—, "Апокрифна литература," in: *Старобългарска Литература: Енциклопедичен Речник* (ed. Д. Петканова; Велико Търново, 2003) 44–45.
Pichhadze, A.A. (Пичхадзе, А.А.) "Яыковые особенности древнерусских переводов с греческого," in: *Международный съезд славистов* (*12, 1998, Краков*). *Российская делегация* (Москва, 1998).
Pigin, A.V. (Пигин, А.В.) "Видения потустороннего мира в рукописной традиции XVIII–XX вв.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 50 (1996) 551–557.
Polivka, Ju. (Поливка Ю.) "К славянским повериям о мироздании," *Этнографическое Обозрение* 1.8 (1891) 252.
Poljakova, Ja. (Полякова, Я.) "Материалы о развитии дуалистических народных сказок у славян," *Slavia* 34.3 (1965) 456–468.
Pop, R. (Поп, Р.) "К вопросу о судьбе апокрифических апокалипсисов о земном рае у южных и восточных славян," *IX Международный съезд славистов. Резюме докладов и письменных сообщений* (Москва, 1983) 244–245.
Popov, A.N. (Попов А.Н.) *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Вып. 2; Москва, 1869) 162–169.
—, *Историко-литературный обзор древне-русских полемических сочинений против латинян* (*XI–XV в.*) (Москва, 1875) [Repr. London: Variorum Reprints, with an introduction by Ivan Dujchev, 1972].
—, *Книга бытия небеси и земли* (*Палея историческая*) (Москва, 1881).
—, *Влияние церковного учения и древнерусской духовной письменности на миросозерцание русского народа, и в частности на народную словесность в древний допетровский период* (Казань, 1883).
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) "Народные духовные стихи и легенды," *Православный Собеседник* 3 (1869) 54–92.
—, *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872).
—, *История русской словесности* (Казань, 1876).
—, *Апокрифические молитвы по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки* (Казань, 1878).
—, *Разбор сочинения В. Мочульского "Историко-литературный анализ стиха о Голубиной книге"* (*Варшава, 1887*) (СПб., 1890).
Pypin, A.N. (Пыпин А.Н.) "Легенды и апокрифы в древней русской письменности," *Вестник Европы* 3 (1894) 291–339.
Rjazanovskij, F. (Рязановский, Ф.) *Демонология в древнерусской литературе* (Москва, 1916).
Romodanovskaja, E.K. (Ромодановская Е.К.) *Повести о гордом царе в рукописной традиции XVII–XIX веков* (Новосибирск, 1985).
Rozhdestvenskaja, M.V. (Рождественская М.В.) "Апокрифы," in: О.В. Творогов, *Литература Древней Руси. Биобиблиографический Словарь* (Москва, 1996) 15–17.
—, "Апокрифические памятники в литературе Древней Руси (эсхатологические видения об аде и рае): Основные результаты и перспективы

исследования," in: *Гуманитарная наука в России*: *Соросовские лауреаты* (Москва, 1996) 54–61.
—, "Апокрифы; Апокрифы библейские," *Российский гуманитарный энциклопедический словарь* (3 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 2002) 1.100.
—, "Роль библейских апокрифов в культуре Древней Руси: апокрифы как литературный текст," in: *Литература, культура и фольклор славянских народов. Материалы конференции* (Москва, 2002) 3–12.
—, "Время апокрифа: Когда возрадовался весь мир?" in: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Время источника и время в источнике* (Москва, 2004) 167–170.
—, "Апокрифы в сборнике XVI в. из Стокгольмской Королевской библиотеки (A 797)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 55 (2004) 387–393.
—, *Библейские апокрифы в литературе и книжности Древней Руси*: *Историко-литературное исследование* (Диссертация доктора наук; С.-Петербург, 2004).
Rzhiga, V.F. (Ржига В.Ф.) "Новая версия о земном рае," *Byzantinoslavica* 2 (1930) 374–383.
Saharov, V. (Сахаров, В.) *Эсхатологические сочинения и сказания в древней русской письменности и влияние их на народные духовные стихи* (Тула, 1879).
Santos-Otero, A. de., *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der altslavischen Apokryphen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1978–1981). [Reviewed by F.J. Thompson in: *The Slavonic and East European Review* 63.1 (1985) 73–98].
—, "Das Problem der kirchenslawischen Apokryphen," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 1 (1962) 123–132.
Shchapov, A.P. (Щапов А.П.) "Смесь христианства с язычеством и ересями в древнерусских народных сказаниях о мире," *Православный собеседник* 1 (1861) 249–283;
—, "Исторические очерки народного миросозерцания и суеверия," in: А.П. Щапов, *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; С.-Петербург, 1906) 47–172.
Shchegolev, P.E. (Щеголев П.Е.) "Очерки истории отреченной литературы: Сказание Афродитиана," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 4.1 (1899) 148–199; 4.3 (1899) 1304–1344.
Schuvalov, S.V. (Шувалов С.В.) "Дуалистические апокрифы в древней русской литературе: Апокриф о споре и борьбе дьявола с Иисусом," *Ученые записки Московского педагогического дефектологического института* (Т. 1. Москва, 1941) 179–221.
Sedakova, O.A. (Седакова, О.А.) "О принципе подхода к изучению древнерусских апокрифов," *Культура и общество Древней Руси* (*X–XVII вв.*) (*Зарубежная историография*) (часть 2; Москва, 1988).
Sedel'nikov, A.D. (Седельников А.Д.) "Мотив о рае в русском средневековом прении," *Byzantinoslavica* 7 (1937–1938) 164–173.
Simonov, R.A. (Симонов Р.А.) *Русская астрологическая книжность* (*XI – первая четверть XVIII века*) (Москва, 1998).
Sircova, O. (Сирцова, О.) *Апокрифична апокалиптика, философсъка екзегеза и текстология* (Киев, 2000).
Sobolev, A.N. (Соболев, А.Н.) *Загробный мир по древне-русским представ-*

лениям (*Литературно-исторический опыт исследования древне-русского народного миросозерцания*) (Сергиев Посад, 1913).
Sobolevskij, A.I. (Соболевский А.И.) "*Логика*" *жидовствующих и* "*Тайная Тайных*" (С.-Петербург, 1899).
—, *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв.* (С.-Петербург, 1903).
—, *Древняя церковно-славянская литература и её значение* (Харьков, 1908).
—, *Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии* (С.-Петербург, 1910).
—, "Особенности русских переводов домонгольского периода," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 88.3 (1910) 162–177.
—, *История русского литературного языка* (Ленинград, 1980).
Sokolov, B. (Соколов Б.) "О житийных и апокрифических мотивах в былинах," *Русский филологический вестник* (том 74; Москва, 1916).
Solov'ev, S.V. (Соловьев, С.В.) *К легендам об Иуде предателе* (Харьков, 1895).
Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский М.Н.) "К истории 'Прения Панагиота с Азимитом,'" *Византийский Временник* (1895) 521–530.
—, "Гадания по псалтыри. Тексты гадательной псалтыри и родственных ей памятников и материал для их объяснения," *Памятники древней письменности и искусства* (С.-Петербург, 1898).
—, *Из истории отреченных книг. II. Трепетники* (ПДПИ, вып. 131; СПб., 1899) 1–16.
—, *Переводные сборники изречений в славяно-русской письменности* (Москва, 1902).
—, *Предисловие к Псалтыри жидовствующих в переводе Федора-еврея* (Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских, 2; Москва, 1907).
—, "Аристотелевы врата, или Тайная тайных," *Памятники древней письменности и искусства* (Вып. 171; С.-Петербург, 1908).
—, *История древней русской литературы. Пособие к лекциям в университете. Том 1. Киевский период* (Москва, 1920).
—, *История древней русской литературы. Пособие к лекциям в университете. Том 2. Московский период* (Москва, 1921).
—, *Славянская письменность XI–XIV вв.* (Петроград, 1927).
—, "'Аристотелевы врата' и 'Тайная Тайных,'" *Сборник статей в честь А.И. Соболевского* (Ленинград, 1928).
—, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва, 1960).
Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский И.И.) *Древние славянские памятники юсового письма* (С.-Петербург, 1868).
—, *Сведения и заметки о малоизвестных и неизвестных памятниках* (С.-Петербург, 1866).
—, *Сказание об антихристе в славянских переводах с замечаниями о славянских переводах творений св. Ипполита*: *Разбор книги о них К.И. Невоструева* (С.-Петербург, 1874).
—, "Сказание об антихристе в славянских переводах творений св. Ипполита," *Отчет о пятнадцатом присуждении наград графа Уварова* (С.-Петербург, 1874) 44–362.

—, *Древние памятники русского письма и языка* (2 изд.; С.-Петербург, 1898).
Stanchev, K. (Станчев, К.) *Поетика на старобългарската литература* (*Основни принципи и проблеми*) (София, 1982).
—, *Стилистика и жанрове на старобългарската литература* (София, 1984).
Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) "Кон средневековната книжевност," *Разгледи* 18.8 (1976) 1005–1015.
—, *Од средневековната книжевност* (Скопје, 1976).
—, *Низ страниците од јужнословенските книжевности* (Скопје, 1977).
—, *Средневековните текстови и фолклорот* (Скопје, 1978) 37–103.
—, *Навраќања кон библијата* (Скопје, 1981).
—, "Апокрифите во Македонија [XI–XIV в.]," *Спектар* 3.5 (1985) 5–22.
—, *Мегу книжевен текст и фоклор* (Скопје, 1987).
Strochal, R. *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priće i legende, sobrao iz starich hrv. glagoliskich rukopisa 14–18. vijeka R.S.U. Bjelovaru* (1917).
Sumcov, N.F. (Сумцов Н.Ф.) *Очерки истории южнославянских апокрифических сказаний и песен* (Киев, 1888).
Syrcov, I. (Сырцов И.) *Мировоззрение наших предков русских славян-язычников до крещения Руси* (Кострома, 1897).
Taube, Moshe. "On Two Related Slavic Translations of the Song of Songs," *SH* 7 (1985) 203–209.
Thompson, F.J., "The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implication for Russian Culture," *Slavica Gandensia* 5 (1978) 117.
—, "A Guide to Slavonic Translations from Greek Down to the End of the Fourteenth Century," in: *Славянска палеография и дипломатия* (София, 1980) 27–36.
—, "Apocrypha Slavica," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 58.2 (1980) 256–268; 63.1 (1985) 91–96.
—, "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anläßlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands in Münster vom 5. bis 9. Juli 1988* (ed. G. Birkfellner; Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deuschland zur Förderung der Slawischen Studien, 16; Köln, 1993) 295–354.
Tolstaja, S. (Толстая, С.) "Рассказы о посещении того света в славянской фольклорной традиции в их отношении к книжному жанру видений," *Jews and Slavs* 10 (2003) 48.
—, "Апокрифы," *История русской литературы X–XVII веков* (М., 1980) 46–49.
Turdeanu, É. *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981).
Turilov, A.A., and A.V. Chernecov (Турилов, А.А. и А.В. Чернецов) "Отреченная книга Рафли," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 324–331.
Tvorogov, O.V. (Творогов О.В.) *Древнерусские хронографы* (Ленинград, 1975).

Uvarov A.S. (Уваров А.С.) "Образ ангела-хранителя с похождениями (отрывок из русской символики)," *Русский архив* 1 (1864) 13–25.
Vagner, G.K. (Вагнер, Г.К.) "Литература, апокрифы и фольклор в творчестве мастеров Всеволода III," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 24 (1969) 75–79.
Varencov, V.G. (Варенцов, В.Г.) *Сборник русских духовных стихов* (С.-Петербург, 1860).
Veselovskij, A.N. (Веселовский А.Н.) *Из истории литературного общения Востока и Запада. Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китоврасе* (С.-Петербург, 1872).
—, "Опыты по истории развития христианской легенды," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 4 (1875) 283–331; *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 5 (1875) 48–130.
—, "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. Вып. 5. XI. Дуалистические поверия о мироздании," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 46.6 (1889) 4.
—, "К вопросу о дуалистических космогониях," *Этнографическое Обозрение* 2.5 (1890) 42.
—, "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. Вып. 6. Гл. XX. Еще к вопросу о дуалистических космогониях," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 53.6 (1891) 123.
—, "Разыскания в области русского духовного стиха. XIX. Эпизод о рае и аде в послании новгородского архиепископа Василия," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук* 53.6 (1892) 91–104
—, "О книге В. Мочульского 'Следы народной Библии в славянской и древнерусской письменности' Одесса, 1893," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 2 (1894) 414–418.
Vjazemskij, P.P. (Вяземский П.П.) "Прение Панагиота с Азимитом," *PDP* (1879) 37–64.
Vodolazkin, E.G. (Водолазкин, Е.Г.) *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палейного повествования XI–XV веков)* (München, 2000).
Vulchanov, S. (Вълчанов Славчо) "Апокрифът в старозаветното богословие," *Духовна култура* 56/9 (1976) 22–30.
—, *Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи* (автореферат кандидатской диссертации, София, 1972).
—, *Тълкуване на книгата на пророк Даниил* (София, 1975).
—, "*Кумрански текстове с апокрифно съдържание и старославянските старозаветни апокрифи*," *Годишник на Духовната Академия* "*Св. Климент Охридский*" 23 (1973/1974) 171–302 (София: 1976).
—, *Отражения на старозаветната апокрифна традиция в средневековната българска култура* (ГДА, 28; София, 1986) 133–183.
—, "Следи от апокрифни елементи в Кирило-Методиевската традиция в средновековна България," *Медиевистика и културна антропология* (София, 1998) 195–210.

Zachinjaev, A. (Зачиняев, А.) *Апокрифы. Духовные Стихи. Легенды* (С.-Петербург, 1909).

Zamaleev, A.F. (Замалеев, А.Ф.) *Философская мысль в средневековой Руси* (XI–XVI вв.) (Ленинград, 1987).

Zhivov, V.M. (Живов, В.М.) "Особенности рецепции византийской культуры в Древней Руси," in: *Из истории русской культуры* (Москва, 2000) 1.552–585.

Zhukovskaja, L.P. (Жуковская, Л.П.) *Текстология и язык древнейших славянских памятников* (Москва, 1976).

Zhuravel' O.D. (Журавель, О.Д.) *Сюжет о договоре человека с дьяволом в русских повестях конца XVII – начала XVIII в.* (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 1994).

Zozulja, L. (Зозуля Л.) "Изображение ада и рая в некоторых древнерусских текстах. (На материалах апокрифических и ранних еретических текстов)," *Русская философия*: *Сборник научных студенческих работ. Тартуский государственный университет. Т. 3* (Тарту, 1971) 14–25.

2. *"Prohibited Books"*

Angelov, B. (Ангелов, Б.) "Списъкът на забранените книги в старобългарската литература," *Известия на Института за българска литература* 1 (1952) 107–159.

Beneshevich, V.N. (Бенешевич, В.Н.) *Древнеславянская кормчая XIV титулов без толкований* (Том 1; Вып. 1–3; С.-Петербург, 1906).

Breyer, M. *O starim i rijetkim jugoslovenskim knjigama* (Zagreb, 1952).

Dujchev, I. (Дуйчев, И.) "Най-старият славянски списък на забранените книги," *Годишник на Българския библиографски институт "Елин Пелин"* 3 (1955) 50–60.

Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) *Литература на изостреи борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 234–244.

Gricevskaja, I.M. (Грицевская, И.М.) *Индексы истинных книг* (С.-Петербург, 2003).

Izbornik, *Изборник великого князя Святослава Ярославича 1073 г.* (С.-Петербург, 1880).

Jacimirskij, A.I. (Яцимирский А.И.), *Апокрифы и легенды. К истории апокрифов, легенд и ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности* (Вып. 1; Петроград, 1915) 15–21.

—, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921) 1–75.

Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) "Slovenski tekstovi kanona o knjigami Staroga i Novaga Zavjeta podjendno s indeksom lažnih knjiga," *Starine* 9 (1877) 91–116.

Jugovic, V. "Gonjene knjige kros vekove. O cenzuri i zabranjenim knigama," *Bibliotekar* 8 (1956) 3–4.

Kagan, M.D., Ponyrko, N.V., Rozhdestvenskaja, M. (Каган М.Д., Понырко Н.В., Рождественская М.) "Описание сборников XV в. Книгописца Ефросина," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 35 (1980) 20–21.

Kerenskij, F. (Керенский Ф.) "Древнерусские отреченные верования и календарь Брюса," *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 3 (1874) 52–79; 4 (1874) 276–342.

Kobjak, N.A. (Кобяк, Н.А.) "Индексы 'ложных' и 'запрещённых' книг и славянские апокрифические евангелия," *Из истории культуры и общественной мысли народов СССР* (Москва, 1984) 19–30.

—, "Индексы отреченных и запрещёных книг в русской письменности," *Древнерусская литература*: *Источниковедение* (Ленинград, 1984) 45–54.

—, "Списки отреченных книг," in: Lihachev, D.S. (ed.) (Лихачев Дмитрий Сергеевич), *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* (*XI – первая половина XIV в.*) (Ленинград, 1987) 441–447.

—, "Индекс ложных книг и древнерусский читатель," *Христианство и церковь в России феодального периода* (Новосибирск, 1989) 352–363.

Kormchaja, *Кормчая* (Москва, 1650).

Kormchaja, *Кормчая* (Москва, 1653).

Kozhuharov, S. (Кожухаров, С.) "Индекс на забранените книги," in: *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия* (София, 1995) 2.114.

Lur'e Ja. S. (Лурье, Я.С.) "Литературная и культурно-просветительная дея-

тельность Ефросина в конце XV в.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 17 (1961) 143–145.

Mil'kov, V.V. (Мильков В.В.) *Древнерусские апокрифы* (Памятники древнерусской мысли. Исследования и тексты, 1; С.-Петербург, 1999) 33–37.

Otrechennye, *Отреченные чтения в России XV-XVIII веков* (Москва, 2002).

Pavlov, A.S. (Павлов, А.С.) *Первоначальный славяно-русский номоканон* (Приложение к ученым запискам имп. Казанского университета, 1869, том 5; Казань, 1869).

Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Донка) *Апокрифна литература и фолклор. Апокрифната художествена проза и фолклорът* (София, 1978) 19–28.

Porfir'ev, I. Ja. (Порфирьев Иван Яковлевич) *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казань, 1872) 142–168.

Pypin, A. (Пыпин, А.) "Исследование для объяснения статьи о ложных книгах," *Летопись Занятий Археографической комиссии (1861)*. (Вып. 1; С.-Петербург, 1862) 1–55.

—, "Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины," *Русское Слово* 1.2 (1862) 48–130.

—, "Для объяснения ложных книг и преданий: Неделя и 'Епистолия о Неделе,'" *Летопись Занятий Археографической комиссии* (Вып. 2; С.-Петербург, 1864) 1–15.

—, *Обзор истории славянских литератур* (С.-Петербург, 1864) 62–80.

Sapunov, B.V. (Сапунов, Б.В.) "'Богословца от словес' в Изборнике 1073 г. и проблема читателя на Руси в XI в," *Изборник Святослава 1037 г.* (Москва, 1977) 234–246.

Semenovker, B.A. (Семеновкер, Б.А.) "Греческие списки истинных и ложных книг и их рецепция на Руси," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 40 (1985) 206–228.

—, *Библиографические памятники Византии* (Москва, 1995) 129–154.

Shchapov, Ja. N. (Щапов Я.Н.) *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси в XI–XIII в.* (Москва, 1978).

Speranskij, M.N. (Сперанский М.Н.) *Из истории отреченных книг. Вып. 1: Гадания по Псалтыри* (С.-Петербург, 1899).

—, *Из истории отреченных книг. Вып. 4: Аристотелевы врата или Тайная Тайных* (С.-Петербург, 1908).

—, "Книги Отреченные," *Богословская Энциклопедия* 11 (1909) 406–434.

Sreznevskij, I.I. (Срезневский И.И.) *Обозрение древних русских списков кормчей книги* (С.-Петербург, 1897).

Tihonravov, N.S. (Тихонравов Н.С.) "История статьи о книгах истинных и ложных. Краткое изложение," *Труды III Археологического съезда (в Киеве)* (Киев, 1878) 1.8–9.

—, "Отреченные книги древней России," in: Тихонравов Н.С. *Сочинения* (Т. 1.; М., 1898) 127–255.

Turilov, A.A., and A.V. Chernecov (Турилов, А.А. и А.В. Чернецов) "К изучению 'отреченных книг,'" *Естественно-научные представления Древней Руси* (ed. P.A. Симонов; Москва, 1988) 111–140.

—, "Отреченные верования в русской рукописной традиции," in: *Отреченные чтения в России XV–XVIII веков* (Москва, 2002) 8–72.

Vladimirov, P.V. (Владимиров П.В.) *Научное изучение апокрифов—отреченных книг в русской литературе во второй половине XIX столетия* (Киев, 1900).

3. *Bogomilism and the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*

Angelov, D. (Ангелов Д.) *Богомилството в България* (София, 1969).
—, *Презвитер Козма и беседата му против богомилите* (София, 1974).
—, "Богомилска книжнина," *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия* (София, 1985) 1.209–212.
—, "Българското богомилство и руското стриголничество," *Руско-български връзки през вековете* (София, 1986) 23–38.
Angelov, D., Batakliev, G., Primov, B. (Ангелов Д., Батаклиев Г., Примов Б.) *Богомилството в България, Византия и Западна Европа в извори* (София, 1976).
Anichkov, E. (Аничков, Е.) "Манихеји и богомили," *Гласник Скопского Научного друштва* 5 (1929) 137–155.
Begunov, Ju. K. (Бегунов, Ю.К.) *Козма Пресвитер в славянских литературах* (София, 1973).
—, "Болгарские богомилы и русские стригольники," *Byzantinobulgarica* 6 (1980) 63–72.
Beyer, H. "Affinitäten zwischen Messalianern und Bogomilen," *Университетски изследвание и преподавания на българска история у нас и в чужбина* (София, 1982) 357–373.
Blagoev, N.P. (Благоев, Н.П.) *Правни и социални възгледи на богомилите* (София, 1912).
Bogomilska Knizhnina, "Богомилска книжнина. [Тайната книга, Адамов запис, Тайнити на Еноха, Детството на Исуса, Разумник]," in: *Старобългарска литература* (София, 1947) 89–109.
Bogomilska Knizhnina, "Богомилска книжнина," in: Dinekov, P. et al. eds., (Динеков, П., К. Куев и Д. Петканова) *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (София, 1961) 144–155.
Bogomilska Knizhnina, "Богомилска книжнина," *Енциклопедия България* (София, 1978) 1.321.
Dinekov, P. (Динеков, П.) "Апокрифи; Богомилство; Богомилска книжнина; Противобогомилска книжнина," in: П. Динеков, *Стара българска литература* (София, 1950) 1.113–144; 167–214.
Dosev, H. (Досев, Х.) "Богомили. История и учение," *Възраждане* 1.4–5 (1907) 76–106.
Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Драгољуб) "Богомилство и орфичка традиција," *Зборник Филозофског факултета* 10.1 (Београд, 1968) 193–210.
—, "Богомилски апокрифни реликти од Македонија," *Македонски фолклор* 3 (1970) 22–23.
—, *Богомилството на Балкану и у Малој Азји. Т. 1. Богомиљски родоначалници* (Београд, 1974).
—, "Манихејска тајна књига у јжнословенској књижевности," *Књижевна историја* 23 (1974) 509–516.
—, "Богомилскиот дуализам како одраз на класните судири во средниот век," *Погледи* 6–7 (1975) 105–112.
—, "Манихејска формула проклињања у словенском преводу," *Balcanica* 6 (1975) 51–61.
—, "Исихазм и богомилство," *Balcanica* 11 (1980) 19–28.

—, *Богомилството на Балкану и у Малој Азји. Т. 2. Богомилство на православном истоку* (Београд, 1982).
—, "Почеци богомилства на Балкану," *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 19–29.
Dragojlović, D. (Драгојловић, Д.) and Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) *Богомилството во средновековната изворна грага* (Скопје, 1978).
—, *Митилогумена на средневековната кирилска писменост* (Скопје, 1990).
George, J.M. *The Dualistic-Gnostic Tradition in the Byzantine Commonwealth with Special Reference to the Paulician and Bogomil Movement* (Ph.D. diss. Wayne State University, 1979).
Georgiev, E. (Георгиев, Е.) "Богомилска литература," in: Е. Георгиев, *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 202–231.
—, "В борба с апокрифната литература и богомилството," in: Е. Георгиев, *Литература на изострени борби в средновековна България* (София, 1966) 233–304.
Hamilton, B. and J. Hamilton, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450* (Manchester, 1998).
Istomin, K. (Истомин, К.) *Историческое исследование о богомилах* (Харьков, 1876).
Jagić, V. (Ягич В.) "Богомилы; ложные книги и народные сказания," in: В. Ягич, *Исторія сербско-хорватской литературы* (Казань, 1879) 95–143.
Kazachkova, D.A. (Казачкова Д.А.) "Зарождение и развитие антицерковной идеологии в Древней Руси XI в.," *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 5 (1958) 283–314.
Kazhdan, A.P. (Каждан А.П.) "Новые материалы о богомилах в Византии XII в.," *Византийский Временник* 2 (1966) 275–277.
Kiselkov, V. (Киселков, В.) *Презвитер Козма. Беседа против богомилите* (София, 1942).
Klibanov, A.I. (Клибанов А.И.) *Реформационные движения в России в XIV-первой половине XVI в.* (Москва, 1960).
—, *Народная социальная утопия в Росии: Период феодализма* (Москва, 1977).
Klincharov, I. (Клинчаров, И.) *Поп Богомил и неговото време* (София, 1947).
Kochev, N. (Кочев, Н.) "Към въпроса за космогоничните възгледи на представителите на гностико-дуализма във Византия и на Балканите през IX–XII в. и античната философия (павликяни и богомили)," *Studia balcanica* 14 (1979) 49–67.
Koev, T. (Коев, Т.) "Павликянски и масалиански религиозни елементи в богомилството," *Известия. Българската патриаршия. Църковно-исторически и архивен институт* 2 (1984) 76–82.
Kondakov, N.P. (Кондаков, Н.П.) "О манихействе и богомилах," *Сборник статей по археологии и византиноведению* (1; Прага, 1927) 289–301.
Lapteva, L. (Лаптева Л.) "Изучение источников по истории богомильства в Болгарии русской историографией XIX—начала XX веков (1 часть)," *Starobulgaristica* 10/1 (1986) 81–96.
—, "Изучение источников по истории богомильства в Болгарии в русской

историографии XIX—начала XX веков," *Историография и источниковедение стран Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы* (Москва, 1986) 140–165.

Ljubarskij, Ja. N. (Любарский Я.Н.) "Расправа императора Алексея Комина с богомилами," *Вопросы истории религии и атеизма* 12 (1964) 310–316.

Loos, M. *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague: Academia, 1974).

—, "Le preténdu témoignage d'un traité de Jean Exarque intitulé 'Sestodnev' et relatif aux Bogomiles," *BS* 13 (1952) 59–67.

—, "Satan als Erstgeborener Gottes (Ein Beitrag zur Analyse des bogomilischen Mythus)," *BB* 3 (1969) 23–35.

Miltenova, A. "Богомилска книжнина," in: Д. Петканова, *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992) 60–62.

—, "Богомилство," in: Д. Петканова, *Старобългарска литература*: *Енциклопедичен речник* (София, 1992) 62–63.

—, "Разобличението на дявола-граматик. (Към историята на старобългарската легенда за произхода на павликяните)," in: *Човек и време. Сборник с научни изследвания в памет на Сабина Беляева* (София, 1997) 287–294.

—, "Littérature apocryphe bogomile et pseudo-bogomile dans la Bulgarie médiévale," *Slavica Occitania* 16 (2003) 37–53.

Minissi, N. "La tradizione apocrifa e le origini del Bogomilismo," *Ricerche Slavistiche* 3 (1954) 97–113.

Naumov, E.P. (Наумов, Е.П.) "Сербские средневековые источники о богомильстве к оценке их свидетельств в историографии," in: *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 89–95.

Obolensky, D. *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge, 1948).

Petkanova, D. (Петканова, Донка) "Към въпроса за връзките на фолклора с богомилството," *Известия на института за българска литература* 6 (1956) 81–101.

—, "Богомилството и апокрифната литература," *Palaeobulgarica* 6/3 (1982) 143–153.

—, "Das Bogomilentum und die apokryphen Literatur," in: *Beiträge zur Bulgaristik* (София, 1984) 43–48.

Popruzhenko, M. (Попруженко, М.Г.) *Козма Пресвитер* (София, 1911).

—, *Козма Пресвитер, болгарский писатель X века* (София, 1936).

Primov, B. (Примов, Б.) *Бугрите. Книга за поп Богомил и неговите последователи* (София, 1970).

Rachki, F. (Рачки, Ф.) *Богомили и патарени* (Београд, 1931).

Radchenko, K.F. (Радченко К.Ф.) "Этюды по богомильству. К вопросу об отношении апокрифов к богомильству," *Изборник Киевский* (Киев, 1904) 29–38.

—, "Этюды по богомильству. Народные космогонические легенды славян в их отношении к богомильству," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 15.4 (1910) 73–131.

—, "Этюды по богомильству. Видение пророка Исайи в пересказах катаров-богомилов," *Сборник статей по литературе и истории в честь Н.П.*

Дашкевича (Киев, 1906) 229–234 [*Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 15.4 (1910) 34–56].

Rigo, A. *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalinismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo* (Firenze, 1989 [Cambridge, 1991])

Sajjar, D. (Сайяр, Д.) "Богомилството и иранските дуалистически учения," *Философска мисъл* 6 (1974) 82–88.

Šanjek, F. "Le phénomène dualiste vu par les historiens balkaniques," *Cahier de Fanjeaux* 14 (1979) 249–270.

Schmaus, A., "Der Neumanichäismus auf dem Balkan," *Saeculum* 2 (1951) 271–299.

Stearns, J.F. *Bogomilism—the Great Bulgarian Heresy* (Chicago, 1929).

Stojchevska-Antić, V. (Стојчевска-Антиќ, Вера) "Богомилскиот дуализм и фолклорот," *Современост* 26.7–8 (1976) 58–84.

—, "Дуалистически елементи во македонскиот фолклор," in: *Богомилството на Балканот во светлината на најновите истражувања* (Скопје, 1982) 113–126.

—, "Неколку книжевни извори за богомилството од XIII и XIV век," *Литературен зборник* 26.3 (1979) 89–102.

—, "Од церковното богомилско и псеудобогомилско наследство," *Годишен зборник. Филозофски факултет на Универзитетот-Скопје* 30 (1979) 575–582.

Stoyanov, Y. *The Hidden Tradition in Europe* (London, 1994).

Turdeanu, É. "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudobogomiles," *RHR* 138/139 (1950) 22–52.

Vasilev, G. (Василев, Г.) "Влияние на зароастризма върху богомилството," *Култура* 3 (1990) 56–68.

—, *Български богомилски и апокрифни представи в английската средновековна култура* (София, 2001).

Vol'man, F. (Вольман Ф.) "В чем значение богомильства для славянских литератур средневековья?" *Сборник ответов на вопросы по литературоведению, IV Международный съезд славистов* (Москва, 1958) 22–24.

Werner, E. "Die Bogomilen in Bulgarien Forschungen und Fortschritte," *StMed* 3 (1962) 249–278.

PART TWO

STUDIES IN THE SLAVONIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

INTRODUCTION

A pre-eminent student of early Jewish mystical traditions, Gershom Scholem continually underlined the importance of Second Temple pseudepigrapha in the history of early Jewish mysticism.[1] Scholem viewed rabbinic and Hekhalot mystical testimonies as part of the extensive history of the Merkabah tradition, the roots of which can be traced to pre-rabbinic apocalyptic circles. He stressed that the influence of pseudepigraphic writings "on the subsequent development of Jewish mysticism cannot be overlooked" since they "undoubtedly contain elements of Jewish mystical religion."[2]

Recent studies of the origin of early Jewish mysticism have not engaged in any systematic treatment of several Jewish pseudepigraphic materials that have survived solely in their Slavonic translations. These texts include *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the *Ladder of Jacob*, and some other documents that show traces of early Jewish mystical developments.[3] This group of Jewish pseudepigrapha—with

---

[1] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1941); *idem*, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, [1960] 1965); *idem*, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken, 1969); *idem*, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset, 1987); *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

[2] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 40.

[3] On Jewish mystical traditions in these texts, see P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.247–248; *idem*, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), esp. 102–111; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992), 109–114; *idem*, "Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom 'Leben Henochs,'" *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83; A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996); M. Himmelfarb, "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses," *Mysteries and Revelations; Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (eds. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; JSPSup., 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 79–90; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), esp. 5.161–164; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*

an enigmatic history of transmission that has preserved these writings only in Slavonic—seems to share a highly developed mystical imagery that makes them stand out in the corpus of early pseudepigraphic texts. These writings have never been studied collectively for their possible connections with early Jewish mysticism. Although Hugo Odeberg, Gershom Scholem, Ithamar Gruenwald, and other students of early Jewish mystical traditions occasionally referred to these texts in their research, pointing to certain provocative allusions that seem to connect these pseudepigrapha with the imagery and conceptual world of the later Merkabah and Hekhalot materials, critics of Scholem's approach have often ignored this important evidence. Despite their formal acknowledgement of the importance of these pseudepigraphic texts for the history of early Jewish mysticism, even Odeberg, Scholem, and Gruenwald have not ventured into systematic study of the evidence of Jewish mystical traditions in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha. The main obstacle, in my judgment, to such work has been the challenge of the Slavonic language which most scholars have tended to view as "esoteric."

It appears that one of the important tasks in clarifying the origins of early Jewish mysticism lies in systematic investigation of such writings as *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* and in understanding their role in the shaping of the imagery and concepts of subsequent Jewish mystical developments.

It should be noted that *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* represent a unique group of texts that share a theophanic and mediatorial language that, in my view, is as different from the mainstream of early apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic writings as it is

---

(AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 50–51; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985); *idem*, "Colossians 1,15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; *idem*, *The Image of the Invisible God. Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), esp. 52–63; W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinic and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920), esp. 236; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969), 109–116; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*; *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah*; *idem*, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*; *idem*, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991).

from later Hekhalot materials. This group of materials gives evidence of the lost *practical* and *literary* development that could very well represent an important transitional stage in early Jewish mystical testimonies, serving as a bridge from the matrix of early Jewish apocalypticism, as it was manifested in early Enochic literature, to the matrix of early Jewish mysticism as it became manifest in rabbinic Merkabah and Hekhalot materials. The articles gathered in this volume intend to illustrate this transitional character of the Slavonic pseudepigraphic evidence by exploring theophanic and angelological imagery found in *2 Enoch*, the *Ladder of Jacob*, the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* and other pseudepigraphical texts preserved in Slavonic.[4] It appears that the theophanic and angelological developments found in these documents occupy an intermediary stage between Second Temple apocalypticism and Hekhalot mysticism and thus exhibit its own distinctive, one might say "proto-Hekhalot," mystical mold. For example, the Slavonic Enoch, similar to some of the Hekhalot writings, already operates with the concept of Metatron and his later titles, such as the Youth, which are absent from early Enochic writings but prominent in such Hekhalot macroforms as *Sefer Hekhalot* and *Hekhalot Rabbati.*

Another important feature of the pseudepigraphical documents investigated in this volume is their polemical thrust that facilitated the aforementioned transition from Jewish apocalypticism to early Jewish mysticism. Slavonic pseudepigraphical texts show an intricate web of mediatorial debates in the course of which the several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in Second Temple Judaism, including Adam, Enoch, Moses, Jacob, Melchizedek, and Noah, undergo polemical appropriation in which their exalted features are transferred to the rival exalted heroes. These polemical tendencies seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of mediatorial debates widespread in the Second Temple period that offered competing accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in the Slavonic pseudepigraphons are part of these debates and represent a response of Enochic, Adamic, Noachic, Jacobite, and Mosaic traditions to the challenges of their rivals.

This collection of studies is to be seen as only a preliminary step in the larger task of appropriating the Slavonic pseudepigraphic evidence

[4] Although some articles included in this volume do not deal directly with the Slavonic texts they nevertheless provide important insights into the afterlife of the Jewish pseudepigraphical texts and traditions in the Eastern Christian environment.

for understanding the origins of early Jewish mysticism. Detailed explorations of such important texts as *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Ladder of Jacob* must follow to help resolve the mystery of this enigmatic collection of pseudepigraphic materials which might have preserved traces of one of the earliest trends of Jewish mysticism. Such investigations could assist in further clarifying the origin and nature of this important religious movement.

THE ENOCH TRADITION

OVERSHADOWED BY ENOCH'S GREATNESS: "TWO TABLETS" TRADITIONS FROM THE *BOOK OF GIANTS* TO *PALAEA HISTORICA*

Introduction

In *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus unveils a certain tradition according to which the descendants of Seth …

> …discovered the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array. Moreover, to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perishing before they become known—Adam having predicted a destruction of the universe, at one time by a violent fire and at another by a mighty deluge of water—they erected two pillars, one of brick and the other of stone, and inscribed these discoveries on both; so that, if the pillar of brick disappeared in the deluge, that of stone would remain to teach men what was graven thereon and to inform them that they had also erected one of brick.[1]

In previous studies, several scholars have noted that although Josephus refers to Seth and his progeny, some features of the "two stelae" story allude to peculiar roles and situations which Jewish lore traditionally associates with the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch. One of these features includes the fact that Josephus credited Seth's descendants with the discovery of "the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array." Scholars have noted that this role from ancient time was traditionally ascribed to Enoch,[2] who in various Enochic traditions is portrayed as an expert in cosmological, astronomical and calendarical secrets.

---

[1] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967), 4.33.

[2] J. VanderKam observes that in the passage about the discovery of astronomical learnings, Josephus "attributes the achievement not to Enoch but, instead, to the descendants of Seth." J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995), 153. H.S.J. Thackeray also notes the "Enochic role" in Josephus' passage. See: Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967), 4.32.

Another important detail in Josephus' account is that the "two stelae" passage appears in *Jewish Antiquities* immediately before the story about the Giants. In 1:73 Josephus tells us that "many angels of God now consorted with women and beget sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue, such confidence had they in their strength; in fact the deeds that tradition ascribes to them resemble the audacious exploits told by the Greeks of the giants."[3] J. VanderKam remarks that the author of *Jewish Antiquities* does not connect this "Enochic-sounding" tale with the seventh patriarch; "rather, he makes Noah preach to them—unsuccessfully."[4] He further suggests that "it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *1 Enoch* 6–11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch."[5] It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between the "two stelae" narrative and some Enochic materials are valid and deserve further investigation.

Besides Josephus' writings,[6] the two tablets/stelae tradition[7] appears in many other sources, including the Armenian *History of the Forefathers*

---

[3] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967), 4.35.

[4] J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 153.

[5] J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 153.

[6] Another important early source about the antediluvian stelae is *Jub.* 8:1–3. On the tablets' tradition in the *Book of Jubilees* see: F. García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (eds. M. Albani *et al.*; TSAJ, 65; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 243–260. On the antediluvian writings see also: R. Eppel, "Les tables de la loi et les tables célestes," *RHPhR* 17 (1937) 401–412; P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 9–13; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 1.242–243; H.L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939), 28ff.; S.M. Paul, "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life," *JANES* 5 (1973) 345–352; W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 110–124.

[7] On the "two stelae" traditions see: W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1989); D. Flusser, "Palaea Historica—An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends," *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971), 51–52; S.D. Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation* (SBLMS, 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1984), 19, 25–26; L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), 1.120–122, 5.148–150; A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT, 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 24–25, 121–123; S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1930), 6–9, 87–90; M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden:

and the Armenian *Abel*, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*, various Christian Chronographers, a fragment from Greek *Palaea Historica*, and some other materials.[8] Even a brief review of these documents shows that the "two stelae" narrative contains traces of the Enochic traditions. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate these associations between the "two stelae" tradition and Enochic tradition.

I. *"Shadows" of the Enochic Roles*

Josephus' account of the two stelae specifically credited the architects of the antediluvian pillars (in Josephus' case, the Sethites)[9] with the discovery of the science of astronomy. It was noted earlier that this reference alludes to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, who, according to the *Astronomical Book*, first received such knowledge from the archangel Uriel during his celestial tour. A closer look at Josephus' passage and other textual evidence associated with the "two stelae" traditions shows that the discovery of astronomy is not the only Enochic achievement that appears to be borrowed in the variety of these stories. It seems that the employment of different Enochic roles is not a rare feature of these traditions. This section of our research will seek therefore to uncover the hidden "shadows" of the Enochic roles that were implicitly preserved in the various "two stelae" narratives.

Brill, 1996), 151, 198; idem, "Selections from 'On the Creation of the World' by Yovhannes Tulkuranci," *Literature on Adam and Eve* (eds. G. Anderson *et al.*; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 210.

[8] The Biblical concept of the two tablets, found in Ex 31–34, transcends the boundaries of the current research.

[9] On the figure of Seth and Sethian traditions see: T. Gluck, *The Arabic Legend of Seth, the Father of Mankind* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1968); A. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT, 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977); R. Kraft, "Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth and His Progeny?" *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.457–458; G. MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24–43; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.472–504; E.C. Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962); M. Stone, "Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.459–471.

Foreknowledge of the Destruction of the World

An account of the Byzantine chronographer John Malalas is one of the many witnesses to the two stelae traditions in medieval Christian chronicles. In the two tablets' story, in his *Chronography* 1:5, he seems to depend entirely on Josephus' evidence.[10] However, his retelling helps us to see some new angles in the familiar story. In his narration of Josephus' account, Malalas points to the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the world as an important characteristic of the authors of the antediluvian stelae.[11] He stresses that "Seth's descendants were god-fearing men and, having foreknowledge of the destruction, or change, that was then to affect mankind, made two tablets, the one of stone and the other of clay."[12] Again, this motif of the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the earth returns us to some situations and roles associated with Enoch.

In the Enochic traditions only a few prediluvian persons received revelation about the upcoming destruction of the world. Among them Enoch and Noah can be found. Although Noah is informed about the future destruction of the world, the specific function of writing down this revelation is usually assigned to Enoch, who in the *Book of the Watchers*,[13] *Jubilees*,[14] and in the *Book of Giants*,[15] is often portrayed as the

---

[10] E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986).

[11] Another Christian chronographer, George the Monk, also notices this feature: "…For the descendants of Seth had been warned in advance from on high about the coming destruction of mankind, and made two stelae, one of stone, the other of brick; and they wrote on them all the celestial knowledge set forth their father Seth, … as Josephus says." Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 215. For the Greek text see: *Georgii Monachi Chronicon* (2 vols.; ed. C. de Boor; Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), 1.10.

[12] E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986), 4.

[13] See *1 Enoch* 12–14.

[14] See *Jub.* 4:23.

[15] See *4Q203 8*: "scri[be…] […] Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter…] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe […] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions…] You should know th[at] no[t…] and your deeds and those of your wives […] they [and the]ir sons and the wives o[f their sons…] for [yo]ur prostitution in the [l]and. It will happen [t]o yo[u…] and lodges a complaint against you and against the deeds of your sons […] the corruption with which you have corrupted it. […] until the coming of Raphael. Behold, destruction […] and which are in the deserts and whi[ch] are in the seas. And tear loose [the] totality [of…] upon you for evil. Now, then, unfasten your chains which ti[e (you)…] and pray. […]." F. García Martínez and

one who writes and delivers the warnings about the future destruction to the Watchers/Giants and to humans. An important detail in these Enochic traditions relevant to the "two stelae" story (which entertains the idea about dual destruction of the world by water and fire), is the fact that, in contrast to Noah who is informed about the Flood, Enoch, due to the specifics of his mediating affairs, also knows about the upcoming destruction of the Watchers/Giants by fire.

Art of Writing

Josephus' passage pictures the descendants of Seth as the ones who inscribe astronomical discoveries on the pillars. It seems that the various "two stelae" stories seek to emphasize the scribal expertise of the Sethites by attributing to them even the invention of writing.

Although Josephus' fragment does not say directly that the descendants of Seth invented writing, other "two stelae" accounts often do so. Thus, the Armenian *Abel* depicts Enosh as the one who invented the letters.[16] The anonymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas[17] and the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* also point to the Sethites' invention of the art of writing by referring to Seth as to the one "who devised the caps of letters."[18]

Upon observing these references to the scribal activities of the various authors of the antediluvian stelae, one can easily recognize certain similarities to Enoch's figure. As was noted earlier, he, similar to the Sethites, was also involved in producing the antediluvian writings dedicated to the astronomical secrets.

The excursus about the unique scribal functions of the seventh antediluvian patriarch in the Enochic traditions can begin with the passage found in *2 Enoch* 22. It provides a striking picture of Enoch's initiation into the scribal activities which takes place near the Throne of

---

E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.411.

[16] "However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name. And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, 'If it passes away by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay.'" M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 151.

[17] *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (ed. L. Dindorf; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1831), 5.

[18] *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (2nd rev. ed.; eds. G. Anderson and M. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 96E.

Glory. During this initiation the Lord himself commands the archangel Vereveil to give a pen to Enoch so that he can write the mysteries explained to him by the angels. This tradition about the scribal functions of the patriarch is already documented in the earliest Enochic literature.[19] The *Book of Giants* fragments label Enoch as the distinguished scribe.[20] In *Jub.* 4:17, he is attested as the one who "learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky…"[21] In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch/Metatron is also depicted as a scribe who has a seat (later, a throne) in the heavenly realm.[22] The theme of Enoch/Metatron's scribal functions became a prominent motif in the later Rabbinic tradition, where according to *b.* Hag. 15a, the privilege of "sitting" beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe"; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

Dissemination and Preservation of the Celestial Knowledge

Josephus' passage makes clear that the purpose of building the stelae was to preserve the astronomical knowledge for the postdiluvian generations. He writes that the Sethites wanted to build the pillars in order "to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perish-

---

[19] In *1 Enoch* 74:2, Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 2.173. Adler draws the reader's attention to an interesting passage from Michael Glycas which refers to Uriel's instruction to Seth in a manner similar to Uriel's revelation of the calendarical and astronomical secrets to Enoch in the *Astronomical Book* of *1 Enoch*. "It is said that the angel stationed among the stars, that is the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinctions between hours, months, seasons, and years." Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105. For the Greek text see: *Michaelis Glycae Annales* (ed. I. Bekker; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1836), 228.

[20] *4Q203 8*: "…Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter…] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe…" F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.411.

[21] J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 2.25–26.

[22] This tradition can be seen already in *2 Enoch* 23:4–6, which depicts the angel Vereveil commanding Enoch to sit down: "'You sit down; write everything…' And Enoch said, 'And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately.'" F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.141.

ing before they became known."[23] A similar motif can be found in Enochic traditions where Enoch's writings often serve for the same purpose of the preservation of knowledge in light of the impending flood. In *2 Enoch* 33 the Lord tells Enoch that the main function of his writings is the dissemination of knowledge and its preservation from the impending catastrophe:

> And give them the books in your handwriting, and they will read them and they will acknowledge me as the Creator of everything… And let them distribute the books in your handwritings, children to children and family to family and kinfolk to kinfolk… So I have commanded my angels, Ariukh and Pariukh, whom I have appointed to the earth as their guardians, and I commanded the seasons, so they might preserve them [books] so they might not perish in the future flood which I shall create in your generation.[24]

Despite the apparent "esoteric" character of the knowledge conveyed by the angels and the Lord to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, the dissemination of this information remains one of the major functions of Enoch-Metatron in various Enochic traditions. They depict him as the one who shares astronomical, meteorological, calendarical, and eschatological knowledge with his sons and others during his short visit to the earth. He also delivers knowledge about future destruction to the Watchers/Giants. In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch-Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that "in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage,[25] the ultimate revealer of divine secrets."[26]

Expertise in Astronomical and Calendar Science

Josephus credited the authors of the antediluvian stelae with the discovery of astronomical and apparently calendarical knowledge, since his passage contains the reference to the science of the heavenly bodies and "their orderly array."[27] Another "two stelae" text, drawn from

---

[23] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 4.33.

[24] F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.156.

[25] On Enoch's role as the knower of the secrets see: Andrei A. Orlov, "Secrets of Creation in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Henoch* 22 (2000) 45–62.

[26] H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 27.

[27] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 4.33.

Michael Glycas, also refers to the Sethites discovery of the calendar. It reads that "the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinction between hours, months, seasons and years … ."[28] The "two stelae" traditions also claimed that the Sethites gave astronomical bodies their names. For example, the Armenian account of two stelae found in *Abel* explicitly supports this tradition by referring to Enosh, son of Seth, as the one who "called the planets by name."[29] This tradition, with a reference to Josephus, is repeated in the Chronicle of John Malalas.[30] The account about the naming of the planets also appears in the anonymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas.[31] In this text Seth is the one who called the planets by name. The account even refers to the specific Greek names, which Seth gave to the planets.

The depictions of the Sethites' achievements in astronomical science echoes traditional Enochic roles. Already in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch*, Enoch is portrayed as the one who learned knowledge about the movements of the celestial bodies from the archangel Uriel. In the *Astronomical Book* the knowledge and revelation of cosmological and astronomical secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch. The origin of these roles in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is depicted as the one who "saw all secrets of heaven…"[32] *Jub.* 4:17 also attests to this peculiar role of the seventh patriarch. A large portion of *2 Enoch* is dedicated to Enoch's initiation into the treasures of meteorological, calendarical and astronomical lore during his celestial tour. Later Merkabah developments also emphasize the role of Enoch as the "Knower of Secrets." According to *3 Enoch* 11:2, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold "deep secrets and wonderful mysteries."[33]

---

[28] Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105; *Michaelis Glycae Annales* (ed. I. Bekker; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1836), 228.

[29] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 151.

[30] "…the names which Seth, the son of Adam, and his children had given the stars, as the most learned Josephus has written in the second book of his *Archeology*." E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986), 4.

[31] *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (ed. L. Dindorf; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1831), 5–6.

[32] M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2.128.

[33] P. Alexander "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.264.

Several scholars have noted the possible Enochic prototype behind the Sethites' role as the experts in astronomical and calendarical science. M. Stone, remarking on the passage from *Abel*, observes that "the tradition connecting Seth with the invention of the names of the stars is unusual. It may be related to the more prevalent tradition attributing the invention of both writings and astronomy to Enoch."[34]

In the distant past, R.H. Charles also noted that in the Byzantine chronicles many discoveries attributed to Seth reflect a transfer of "Enoch's greatness to Seth."[35] In reference to Charles' comments, W. Adler observes that the tradition attested in the "two stelae" narrative of Josephus and widespread in the Byzantine chronicles "became the basis for the attribution to Seth of numerous revelations and discoveries, many of them precisely parallel to those imputed to Enoch."[36]

Preaching to the Giants

It was observed earlier that in Josephus' account the "two stelae" story is attached to the Watchers/Giants narrative. The author of *Jewish Antiquities* portrays Noah's unsuccessful preaching to the Giants. J. VanderKam notes that "it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *1 Enoch* 6–11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch, although in those chapters Noah does not try to improve the overbearing giants."[37] Indeed, despite the fact that some traditions point to a possible close relationship between Noah and the Giants in view of his miraculous birth,[38] his "experience" in dealing with the Giants in Enochic traditions cannot be even compared with Enoch's record. In various Enochic materials, Enoch is pictured as the special envoy of the Lord to the Watchers/Giants with a special, long-lasting mission to this rebellious group, both on earth and in other realms. The *Book of the Watchers* depicts him as the intercessor to the fallen angels. According to *Jub.* 4:22, Enoch "…testified to the Watchers who had sinned with the daughters of men… Enoch testified against all

[34] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 151.

[35] *APOT* 2.18.

[36] Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105.

[37] VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generation*, 153.

[38] J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115.

of them."[39] In the *Book of Giants* Enoch delivers the written "sermon," reprimanding the Watchers/Giants' sinful behavior and warning them about the upcoming punishment.[40] *2 Enoch* 18 portrays Enoch's "preaching" to the Watchers during his celestial tour, encouraging them to start the liturgy before the face of the Lord.[41]

An examination of the surviving evidences to the "two stelae" story shows that some of them attest to a tradition different from that attested in Josephus. Instead of Noah's preaching to the Giants, they portray Enosh's preaching to the sons of God. Two references about the preaching to the sons of God in the "two stelae" traditions are especially important. Both of them have been preserved in the Armenian language and include the Armenian *History of the Forefathers* and *Abel*.

The Armenian *History of the Forefathers* 40–44 deals with the two stelae story. In 45 the narrative continues with the description of Enosh's preaching:

> 40 Sixth, because he [Enosh] set up two pillars against the sons of Cain, these are hope and good works, which they did not have.
>
> 41 Seventh, that he made writings and wrote on stela(e) of baked brick and bronze, and he prophesied that the earth will pass through water and fire on account of the sins of humans. And he cast the baked brick into the water and the bronze into the fire, in order to test (them), if the fire was to come first, the bronze would melt, and if the water was to come first, the brick would be destroyed. And by this means he learned that the water was destined to come, and then fire. And these are a work of hope.
>
> 42 And the writings on the two stelae told the names of all things, for he knew that by lispers, stutterers and stammerers the language was destined to be corrupted.
>
> 43 And they confused and changed the names of the objects that had come into being, which Adam had named and fixed. On this account he wrote (them) on the two stelae and left them, so that if the water came first and destroyed the pillar of baked brick, the bronze writing and names of things would remain, so that after the flood and the passing of times it might come to use.

---

[39] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.27–28.
[40] See *4Q203 8*.
[41] Andersen, 1.130–133.

44 Likewise, also if the fiery flood[42] and the bronze (i.e., stele) melted and ruined the writing, the earthen one might remain more baked. And this is a true action of hope.

45 Eighth, that Enosh preached to his sons to take on a celibate and immaculate way of life, for the sake of the just recompense of God. Two hundred persons, having learned this from him, remembered the life of paradise and established a covenant for themselves to live purely. And they were called "sons of God" on account of hope and of being busy with heavenly desire. For the glory of Christ, our hope.[43]

The Armenian *Abel* also portrays Enosh as the author of the stelae. However, in contrast to the previous text, it connects the tradition about the sons of God with Enoch and his antediluvian writings that survived the Flood:

4.3 However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name.

4.4 And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, "If it passes away by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay."

4.5 And they were called true sons of God because God loved them, before they fornicated.

4.6 By this writing the vision of Enoch was preserved, he who was transferred to immortality. And after the Flood, Arpachshad made Chaldean writing from it, and from the others (were made).[44]

Several details in these two Armenian accounts about the preaching to the sons of God are important for establishing possible connections with Enochic traditions:

1. Both texts use the terminology of "sons of God";
2. *History of the Forefathers* applies this term to the audience of Enosh's preaching;
3. *History of the Forefathers* also specifies the number of the sons of God as two hundred persons;

---

[42] *b. Sanh.* 108b refers to a flood of water and a flood of fire. See Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*, 122.

[43] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 198–200.

[44] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 151–152.

4. *Abel* 4.5 describes the sons of God as those whom God loved before they fornicated;
5. *History of the Forefathers* 45 refers to the possible angelic status of the sons of God, describing them as those who "remembered the life of paradise" and "being busy with the heavenly desire."[45]

An important characteristic in both texts is the reference to the "sons of God." Who are these sons of God? In the Bible the term can be traced to the Giants story in Gen 6. Scholars, however, note that in later Christian accounts the term "the sons of God" was often used in reference to the Sethites.[46] They also note the peculiar tendency to equate the Watchers and the Sethites in various accounts of the "two stelae" tradition.[47] It is quite possible that the authors of the two Armenian accounts understand the sons of God to be the Sethites. It is also evident that the prototype of the story was connected with the Watchers' story and Enoch's preaching to them. Several details in the texts point to this connection. First, *History of the Forefathers* 45 defines the number of "the sons of God" as two hundred. In the Enochic traditions this numeral appears often in reference to the number of the Watchers who descended on Mount Hermon.[48] Another important feature in the Armenian accounts is the description of the sons of God as those whom God loves before they fornicated. It may allude to the exalted status of the Watchers and their leaders before their descent on Mount Hermon.

The important aspect of the preaching story found in *History of the Forefathers* 45 involves the question why instead of Noah or Enoch this text depicts Enosh as the one who preaches to the sons of God. It is possible that Enoch's name here was misplaced with that of Enosh. M. Stone observes that Enosh and Enoch are often confused in the

---

[45] M. Stone observes that the Sethites are often called angels in some Greek patristic and Byzantine sources. Cf. M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 150.

[46] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 150. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 113–116. For a Christian interpretation of the "sons of God" see Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation*, 47–107.

[47] Cf. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 92.

[48] Cf. *1 Enoch* 6:6: "And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2.68.

Armenian tradition.[49] It is noteworthy that the story about the sons of God found in *Abel* uses Enoch instead of Enosh. It might refer to the Enochic background of the Armenian accounts. The "two stelae" tradition from the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* further supports our contention. Chapter 53 of the *Life* also has the passage about Enoch's "preaching" immediately after the "two stelae" account.[50]

II. *Enochic Authorship of the Tablets*

Palaea's Account

In *Palaea Historica*,[51] the Byzantine medieval compendium, the following passage, referring to Enoch's authorship of the two tablets can be found:

> Concerning Enoch. Enoch was born and became a good and devout man, who fulfilled God's will and was not influenced by the counsels of the giants. For there were giants (on earth) at that time. And Enoch was translated (to heaven) by God's command, and no one saw [how] his removal [happened].
>
> Concerning Noah. In the days when the giants were around and did not want to glorify God, a man was born whose name was Noah, who was

---

[49] M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 151.

[50] "On these stones was found what Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied before the flood about the coming of Christ: "Behold the Lord will come in his sanctuary (in his holy soldiers, in his soldiers, in his holy clouds?) to render judgment on all and to accuse the impious of all their works by which they have spoken concerning him—sinners, impious murmurers, and the irreligious who have lived according to their feelings of desire, and whose mouths have spoken pridefully." *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (2nd rev. ed.; eds. G. Anderson and M. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 96E. For the Latin text of *Vita*, see also: W. Meyer, "Vita Adae et Evae," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosoph.-philologische Klasse* (Munich, 1878), 14.3:185–250; J.H. Mozley, "The Vita Adae," *JTS* 30 (1929) 121–149.

[51] On *Palaea Historica* see: D. Flusser, "Palaea Historica—An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends," *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971), 48–79; M.N. Speranskij, *Is istorii russko-slavjanskih literaturnyh svjazei* (Moscow: 1960), 104–147; Émile Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVT, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 392–403; V. Tvorogov, "Paleja Istoricheskaja," in: *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi (Vtoraja polovina XIV–XVI v.)* (2 vols.; ed. D.S. Lihachev; Leningrad: Nauka, 1989), 2.160–161; On various manuscripts of *Palaea Historica* cf. A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893), L–LI.

> devout and feared God, and like Enoch he was not influenced by the giants' counsels…
>
> …When the giants heard that the righteous Noah was building an ark for the Flood, they laughed at him. But Enoch, who was still around, was also telling the giants that the earth would either be destroyed by fire or by water. And the righteous Enoch was doing nothing else but sitting and writing on marble (tablets) and on bricks the mighty works of God which had happened from the beginning. For he used to say: "If the earth is destroyed by fire, the bricks will be preserved to be a reminder [for those who come after] of the mighty works of God which have happened from the beginning; and if the earth is destroyed by water, the marble tablets will be preserved." And Enoch used to warn the giants about many things, but they remained stubborn and impenitent, nor did they want to glorify the Creator, but instead each [of them] walked in his own will of the flesh…[52]

A glance at the *Palaea* fragment shows that it is completely different from the previous "two stelae" accounts based on Josephus' story. The main distinction is that Enoch, who in the Sethites' accounts occupied a peripheral role, stays now in the center of his own authentic narrative. The fact that the preaching to the Giants preceded the writing of the stelae emphasizes that the focus of the story was changed and the proper order of the events was restored.

This leads to important corrections. Unlike the Sethites in Josephus' account, Enoch does not try to preserve only one facet of the antediluvian knowledge, astronomical or calendar, but attempts to save the totality of the celestial knowledge, as it was commanded to him by the Lord in some Enochic accounts. Just as in *2 Enoch*, he writes about everything that happened before him.

In contrast to the Sethites' account, the *Palaea* does not mention the name of Adam. In the Sethites' "two stelae" stories, Adam serves as the mediator of the divine revelation, through whom the Sethites receive the knowledge about the future destruction of the earth. The *Palaea* does not refer to the Adamic tradition, since Enoch and Noah, unlike the Sethites, have direct revelation from God about the upcoming destruction.

These differences indicate that the author of the passage in *Palaea Historica* seems to draw on traditions different from those represented in Josephus. It is also evident that the stories in *Palaea* and Jose-

---

[52] A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893), 196–198.

phus[53] rely on the common source in which Noah's figure was exalted.[54] In the Josephus account, however, the Noachic tradition[55] appears to be overwritten by the Adamic tradition.[56] In the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran writings, the Adamic and Priestly-Noah tradition often compete with and suppress each other.[57] The "two stelae" story from *Jewish Antiquities* might contain the traces of such polemics.

---

[53] One will recall that the Josephus account has Noah, rather than Enoch, preach to the Giants.

[54] In *Palaea* the story of Noah looms large. The two tablets story is situated in the middle of a large Noachic account which occupies three chapters in *Palaea Historica*. Unfortunately, in our presentation of the *Palaea* fragment, we were unable to reproduce this lengthy Noachic narrative. For the full text of the Noachic account see A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893), 196–200.

[55] On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231; D. Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 123–150; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 24–44; F. García Martínez, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–108; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 242–254; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henoch* 22 (2000) 207–221; J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115; J.M. Scott, "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPS, 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 368–381; R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71; M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149; M. Stone, "Noah, Books of," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971), 12.1198; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32; J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 213–231; Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah" *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–181.

[56] The influence of the Adamic tradition(s) can be found in the majority of the two stelae stories which are based on the Josephus account.

[57] See M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149.

Water and Fire

Among the several two stelae/tablets stories we have examined, the passage from *Palaea Historica* baffles the reader more than the rest. It portrays Enoch unceasingly writing on the tablets made from marble and brick. The depiction takes place in the midst of the Noachic narrative where the theme of the Flood comes to the fore. The reference to the tablets for the fire destruction therefore appears puzzling since the assurance of the approaching Flood makes them completely unnecessary. Why does Enoch need the tablets made from the two types of material if it is already certain that the earth will perish inevitably in the imminent Flood?

The answer to these questions can possibly be found by reference to the *Book of Giants*, where the theme of the Enochic tablets also looms large. Although the temporal locus of this narrative appears to be placed before the approaching Flood, it seems to entertain the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and by fire.

One of the Qumran Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* (*4Q530*) depicts a dream in which a giant sees the destruction of a certain "garden" by water and fire.[58] Most scholars take this symbolic dream to signify the upcoming destruction of the world by water and fire. J. Reeves observes that "the Qumran passage reflects an eschatological conception[59] well attested in the Hellenistic era of a dual cosmic destruction, one of which employs water (*mabbul shel mayim*) and the other fire (*mabbul shel 'esh*)."[60]

In their analysis of the dream about the destruction of the garden, scholars have tried to establish a connection between the material from *4Q530* and the late Rabbinic text known as the *Midrash of Shem-*

[58] *4Q530*: "…Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to […] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, […in] my dream; I have seen in this night […] gardeners and they were watering […] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk […] I watched until tongues of fire from […] all the water and the fire burned in all […] Here is the end of the dream." F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 2.1063.

[59] Some scholars point to a possible Mesopotamian background in this imagery of the dual destruction of the world. Cf. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*, 24, 123; J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992), 145.

[60] Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology*, 88.

hazai and Azael.[61] This rabbinic account was allegedly a part of the no longer extant *Midrash Abkir*.[62] Some scholars point to striking similarities between *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* and the dream from *4Q530*.[63] Similarly to *4Q530*, the midrash also portrays the giant's dream about the destruction of the garden in a way that symbolizes the destruction of the world.[64]

The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has survived in several manuscripts,[65] including the composition known as the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. It is noteworthy that in the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* is situated between two almost identical stories connected with the "two stelae" tradition. In M. Gaster's edition[66] of the *Chronicles*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* occupies chapter 25. In chapter 24, the following story can be found:

> … Jubal discovered the science of music, whence arose all the tunes for the above two instruments. This art is very great. And it came to pass, when he heard of the judgments which Adam prophesied concerning the two trials to come upon his descendants by the flood, the destruction and fire, he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of white marble, and the other of brick, so that if one would melt and crumble away on account of the water, the other would be saved. 24:6–9.[67]

In chapter 26 of Gaster's edition, right after the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the story about the two pillars is repeated again[68] in a slightly

---

[61] J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 321–330; Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology*, 86–87; L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 114–115.

[62] On Midrash Abkir see: H.L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1991), 341; A. Marmorstein, "Midrash Abkir," *Debir* 1 (1923) 113–144.

[63] For a detailed discussion of the similarities see: Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology*, 86–87. For the criticism of Reeves' position see: L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 115.

[64] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

[65] Cf. J.D. Eisenstein, *Otzar midrashim* (2 vols.; New York: J.D. Eisenstein, 1915), 2.549–550; A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrasch* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1967), 4.127–128; Ch. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1940), 29–31; R. Martini, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos* (Lipsiae: Sumptibus haeredum F. Lanckisi, 1687), 937–939.

[66] *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899).

[67] *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899), 51.

[68] M. Gaster in his commentary on both passages about the two tablets' tradition

different form.[69] The second time, it is placed before the account about Enoch and the Flood.[70]

An important detail in Jubal's fragments is that they do not connect the "two stelae" narrative with the Sethites, the constant feature of the stories based on the Josephus account.[71] Jubal represents the Cainites. Both texts from the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* do not seem to object to this line of descent. Jubal, as well as the Sethites, knows about Adam's prophecy. The reference to Adam in Jubal's story might indicate that the main theological concern of the writers/editors of the "two stelae" accounts was not the prominent role of the Sethites, but rather Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth. Here again the traces of the Adamic tradition(s) are clearly observable.

It was mentioned earlier that the *Book of Giants* entertains the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and fire. Although the Bible and the Pseudepigrapha commonly refer to the Flood they rarely use the image of the earth's destruction by fire. It also appears that the Enochic Watchers/Giants account is one of the few places in intertestamental Jewish literature where the necessity of such fire annihilation finds a consistent theological explanation. In spite of the fragmentary nature of the extant materials, they nevertheless are able to demonstrate the complexity of the theme in the *Book of Giants*.

It should be noted that the allusions to the future judgment by fire are not confined only to the Aramaic portions found at Qumran. The fragments of the *Book of Giants* which have survived in other languages give additional details of this theme in the book.[72] They include several

---

noted that "…in chapter 26 our compiler seems to have intercalated from the middle of paragraph 15 on to the end of 20 a tradition that occurs once before in chapter 24, paragraph 6–9, and which is missing in the Latin. It is not at all improbable that this portion belongs to the old original." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, lxxv.

[69] "…Jubal heard the prophecy of Adam concerning two judgments about to come upon the world by means of the flood, the dispersion and fire, that he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of fine white marble and the other of brick, so that in the event of the one melting and being destroyed by the waters, the other would be saved. 26:15–20." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 56.

[70] "…and Enoch—who was the author of many writings—walked with God, and was no more, for God had taken him away and placed him in the Garden of Eden, where he will remain until Elijah shall appear and restore the hearts of the fathers to the children. And the Flood took place." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 57.

[71] Another distinctive feature in Jubal's story is that it refers to white marble as one of the materials used for the stelae. As far as I know, the only other text that refers to this component in the "two stelae" stories is Enoch's account from *Palaea Historica*.

[72] Additional evidence that the motif of fire destruction played an important role in

Manichaean fragments in Middle-Persian, Partian, and Coptic which address the motif the annihilation of the world by fire.[73]

Tablets

We mentioned earlier that there are some indications that the theme of the Enochic tablets play quite a prominent role in the *Book of Giants*. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the extant materials does not allow us to draw a coherent picture of the "tablets" tradition in this

---

the *Book of Giants* is a passage from George Syncellus, which some scholars believe might be related to the textual tradition of the *Book of Giants*. See: Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 318–320; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 179. Syncellus' fragment describes the fire destruction of Mount Hermon, the prominent topos where the Watchers' descent once took place. The text preserved in Syncellus reads: "…and again, concerning the mountain, on which they swore and bound themselves by oath, the one to the other, not to withdraw from it for all eternity: There will be descend on it neither cold, nor snow, nor frost, nor dew, unless they descend on it in malediction, until the day of the Great Judgment. At that time it will be burned and brought low, it will be consumed and melted down, like wax by fire. Thus it will be burned as a result of all its works…" Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 318. For the critical edition of the text see: Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. A.A. Mosshammer; Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1984), 26–27. The story of fire destruction of Mount Hermon in Syncellus echoes *1 Enoch* 10:13–16, where God tells Michael that He has prepared the destruction by fire for the Watchers.

[73] The first group of fragments is connected with the final fire punishment of "sinners" (in Henning's opinion, "sinners" represent the Watchers and the Giants) under the eyes of the Righteous. Henning believes that this group of texts belonged to the Kawân. F—"(*Col. D*) …sinners…is visible, where out of this fire your soul will be prepared (for the transfer) to eternal ruin (?). And as for you, sinful misbegotten sons of the Wrathful Self, cofounders of the true words of that Holy One, disturbers of the action of Good Deed, aggressors upon Piety,…-ers of the Living…, who their…

(*Col. E*)… and on brilliant wings they shall fly and soar further outside and above that Fire, and shall gaze into its depth and height. And those Righteous that will stand around it, outside and above, they themselves shall have power over that Great Fire, and over everything in it…blaze…souls that…

(*Col. F*)…they are purer and stronger [than the] Great Fire of Ruin that sets the worlds ablaze. They shall stand around it, outside and above, and splendor shall shine over them. Further outside and above it they shall fly (?) after those souls that may try to escape from the Fire. And that…" W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 68. Several other Manichaean fragments allude to the motif of the fire annihilation of the world. They include a Parthian fragment about the Great Fire and a Coptic fragment from Manichaean Psalm book where the name of Enoch is mentioned: N—"And the story about the Great Fire: like unto (the way in which) the Fire, with powerful wrath, swallows this world and enjoys it…;" Q—"The Righteous who were burnt in the fire, they endured. This multitude that were wiped out, four thousand … Enoch also, the Sage, the transgressors being…" W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 72.

enigmatic text. It is important, however, to emphasize several features of this theme relevant to the subject of our investigation:

1. It is clear that the story of the tablets represents a major theme in the original *Book of Giants*. In a relatively small amount of the extant Qumran materials of the *Book of Giants*, the *contextual* reference to the tablet(s) occurs six times in three fragments: *2Q26*;[74] *4Q203* 7BII,[75] and *4Q203* 8.[76] The tablets are also mentioned in the Sundermann fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants*[77] and in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.[78]

2. Several fragments of the *Book of Giants* refer to *two* tablets. The two tablets are addressed in *4Q203* 7 BII and *4Q203* 8. This number of tablets also occurs in the Middle Persian fragment of the *Book of Giants* published by W. Sundermann.[79]

3. The extant materials ascribe the authorship of the tablets to Enoch. *4Q203* 8 refers to a "copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter…] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe…"[80] Enoch is described as the distinguished scribe. He is also portrayed as the one who copied the tablets, since the reference to a "copy of the seco[n]d tablet" in *4Q203* 8:3–4 occurs in conjunction with his name.

---

[74] *2Q26* "[…and] they washed the tablet to er[ase…] […] and the water rose above the [tab]let […] […] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which […] […]…[…] to them all […]." F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.221.

[75] *4Q203* 7: "[…] […] to you, Maha[wai…] the two tablets […] and the second has not been read up till now […]." F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.411.

[76] *4Q203 8*: "…Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter…] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe […] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions…] …" F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.411.

[77] W. Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch," *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 491–505.

[78] "One saw a great stone spread over the earth like a table, the whole of which was written over with lines (of writing). And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with a knife in his hand and he was erasing and obliterating all the lines, save one line with four words upon it." Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

[79] W. Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch," *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 495–496.

[80] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.411.

4. The reference to Enoch's copying of the tablet is quite intriguing, since "copying" plays a decisive role in the various two tablets/stelae materials mentioned in our research earlier, which are construed around the idea of the duplication of the tablets in various materials.

5. In conclusion to this section, it should be noted that the *Book of Giants*' materials seem to contain traces of a more developed and multifaceted tradition about the tablets than the later "two tablets" accounts. In the *Book of Giants* copying is only one of the several roles Enoch has in relation to the tablets. In this text the theme of tablets seems closely connected with other traditional roles of the elevated Enoch such as those of Mediator[81] and the Witness of the Divine Judgment.[82] These Enochic roles are reflected in the peculiar functions of the tablets in the *Book of Giants*. The tablets serve as a record of accusations against the Watchers/Giants, representing the written account of their sins.[83] The tablets are also a mediating tool in the dialogue between God and the Watchers/Giants via the representatives of the both parties—Enoch and Mahaway.[84] These peculiar functions are only slightly hinted at in later tablet traditions.[85] The later "two tablets" traditions seem primarily preoccupied with the idea of copying, where the tablets are portrayed as the specific means for the preservation of knowledge in the impending catastrophe. They therefore appear to represent only one facet of the complicated story of the Enochic tablets.

---

[81] The "mediating" function of Enoch remains prominent during the whole history of the Enochic traditions. It has been shown previously that in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*, the seventh antediluvian patriarch "transmits" celestial knowledge to various human and angelic agents. In the Merkabah tradition, Metatron/Enoch is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him and to humankind.

[82] On Enoch's roles see A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86.

[83] Cf. *4Q203* 8:6–15 and possibly *2Q26*. Apparently the last one pictures an attempt to erase (wash out) this record of iniquities: *2Q26* "[…and] they washed the tablet to er[ase…] and the water rose above the [tab]let […] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which […] to them all […]." F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.221.

[84] F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 110.

[85] *Palaea Historica* alludes to the fact that Enoch starts writing tablets only after the Giants rejected his call to repentance.

Conclusion

1. The first part of our research deals with the "two stelae" stories based on the Josephus account. Our analysis of these accounts shows that they contain traces of the Enochic traditions. It appears that these "two stelae" stories interact with the Enochic traditions by way of attributing various Enochic roles to the alleged "authors" of the antediluvian stelae. These "authors" are usually portrayed as the Sethites. The attribution involves substantial rewriting of the original Enochic motifs and themes. The analysis also shows that the interaction of "two stelae" stories with Enochic traditions seems to involve some details of the Watchers/Giants' story.

2. The passage found in *Jewish Antiquities* and the stories which are based on this account demonstrate the influence of the Adamic tradition(s). In these accounts Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth serves as the reason for the making of the antediluvian stelae.

3. It is also possible that despite the decisive formative influence Josephus' account had on the subsequent "two stelae" stories, it itself represents the Adamic revision of the original two stelae/tablets account based on Noachic/Enochic traditions. Noah's preaching to the Giants in Josephus' account, the host of Enochic roles, and remnants of the Watchers/Giants story in various "two stelae" narratives may point to the Noachic/Enochic prototype.

4. It is possible that the Noachic/Enochic prototext was dedicated neither to the Sethites nor the Cananites who followed Adam's instructions, but rather to Enoch and Noah.

5. The tradition preserved in *Palaea Historica* might directly derive from this Noachic/Enochic original, which has not undergone Adamic revisions.

6. It is possible that some "two stelae" accounts might be connected with, or maybe even derived from, traditions similar to the *Book of Giants*. The circulating of materials related to the *Book of Giants* traditions in medieval Christian milieux does not seem impossible. W. Adler observes that some passages found in Syncellus "imply the existence of

some work circulating in the name of the Giants."[86] He also demonstrates that such references sometimes occur in connection with the two stelae/tablets traditions.[87]

7. In an attempt to find possible antecedents for the two tablets story in the known Noachic/Enochic materials the tablet tradition(s) preserved in the *Book of Giants* fragments were explored.

8. While our comparative analysis of the "two stelae" traditions with materials from the *Book of Giants* revealed some suggestive similarities, it is evident that the extremely fragmentary character of the extant materials from the *Book of Giants* cannot give us definite evidence about the presence of the two stelae/tablets tradition in the original document.

[86] Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 91, n. 68.

[87] Cf. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 91, n. 68 and 181–182.

TITLES OF ENOCH-METATRON IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[1]

> Whoever is dealing with the Account of Creation and the Account of the Chariot must inevitably fail. It is therefore written, "Let this heap of ruins be under your hand" (Isa. 3.6). This refers to things that a person can not understand, unless he fails in them.
>
> (The *Book of Bahir*, 150)

In his introduction to the English translation of *2 Enoch* F.I. Andersen states that "all attempts[2] to locate the intellectual background of the

---

[1] Part of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of SBL/AAR, New Orleans, 23–26 November 1996.

[2] On different approaches to *2 Enoch*, cf. I.D. Amusin, *Teksty Kumrana* (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka, 33/I; Moscow: Nauka, 1971); F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.91–221; C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); *idem*, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ, 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); *idem*, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult; Studien zum slavische Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992); R.H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–163; J.H. Charlesworth, "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation," in J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSS, 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 20–43; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); *idem*, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCS, 7; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981); J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195–2003; J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago: Henry Regenry Company, 1964); U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); J. Fossum, "Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; K. Lake, "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398; N.A. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izuchenju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19

book have failed."[3] Among these endeavors were several efforts to establish the connection between *2 Enoch* and *Ma'aseh Merkabah*.[4] One

(1963) 130–147; *idem*, "K istorii teksta slavjanskoj knigi Enoha (Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v vizantijskoj i staroslavjanskoj literature)," *Vizantijskij vremennik* 24 (1964) 91–108; *idem*, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72–78; J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch in Recent Research," *RSR* 7 (1981) 210–217: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch'," in *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969); S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and J. Jouco Bleeker (eds.), *Types of Redemption* (SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87; J. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," in J.C. Reeves (ed.), *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (EJL, 6; Atlanta, CA: Scholars Press, 1994), 173–203: A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); *idem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1991); *idem, Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987); M. Scopello, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *VC* 34 (1980) 367–385; M.E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2.406–408; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch, a Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995).

[3] Andersen, "2 Enoch," *OTP*, 1.95.

[4] On the Merkabah tradition, see the following sources: P. Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–180; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, A Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (2 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (SJ, 11; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, xi–xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980); I. Gruenwald and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); *idem, The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (TTPS, 11; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, "Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic tradition: Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JJS* 22 (1991) 1–39; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985); P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer *et al.*, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1987–1995); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America,

of the essential contributors to this approach, Hugo Odeberg[5] points out that the similarities in descriptions of celestial titles for Enoch in *2* and *3 Enoch* may be the important evidence of a possible connection between *2 Enoch* and texts of the Merkabah tradition.

The purpose of this chapter is to call attention to some details of these descriptions which might shed new light on the relationship between early Enochic[6] and Merkabah traditions.

The Prince of the Presence

The substantial part of *2 Enoch's* narrative is dedicated to Enoch's ascent into the celestial realm and to his heavenly metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. In these lengthy and elaborated descriptions of Enoch's transformation into a celestial being, on a level with the archangels, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch which was developed later in Merkabah mysticism, that is, the image of the angel Metatron, the Prince of the Presence.

Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of "the Prince of the Presence" in the long recension of *2 Enoch*.

1965); *idem*, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); N. Séd, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49–66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (TSAJ, 28; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

[5] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*.

[6] On the figure of Enoch and Enochic traditions see: M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985); Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha; idem*, *The Pseudepigrapha*; J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 33–67; P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: son origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210; H.L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988); Milik, *The Books of Enoch*; Odeberg, *3 Enoch*; M. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to Armenian Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 1991); M. Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479–492; J. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBLSP* (1978) 1.229–251; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (SBQMS, 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); VanderKam, *Enoch, a Man for All Generations*. On Merkabah features of Enochic traditions, see P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.247–248; Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," xvi–xxi; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 32–51.

He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch*, that the phrase "stand before my face forever"[7] does not serve merely as a normal Hebraism "to be in the presence," but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, שר הפנים.[8]

The title itself is developed mainly in chs. 21–22, which are dedicated to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one finds many promises that Enoch will "stand in front of the face of the Lord forever."[9]

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,[10] which was "crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature."[11] According to the legend of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch "was raised to the rank of first of the angels and שר הפנים (literally, 'prince of the divine face', or 'divine presence')."[12] *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of the tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

The Knower of Secrets

The Merkabah tradition emphasizes the role of Metatron as the "Knower of Secrets," יודע רזים.[13] According to *3 Enoch* he is "wise in the secrets and Master of the mysteries."[14] He is the one who received these secrets from the angels and from the Lord (the Holy One). He serves also as "the Revealer of Secrets," the one who is responsible for the transmission of the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. In ch. 38 of *3 Enoch*, Metatron told R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed secrets to Moses, in spite of the protests of heavenly hosts:

---

[7] **стани пред лицемъ моимь во вѣкы.**

[8] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 1.55.

[9] Cf. 21:3; 21:5; 22:6; 22:7.

[10] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

[11] About different stages in Hekhalot tradition, see Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 67; 98–123.

[12] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

[13] The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1; 74:2 and 80:1. See also 41:1, "And after this I saw all secrets of heaven." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 2.128.

[14] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.30.

> …when I revealed this secret to Moses, then all the host in every heaven on high raged against me and said to me: Why do you reveal this secret to a son of man…the secret by which were created heaven and earth … and the Torah and Wisdom and Knowledge and Thought and the Gnosis of things above and the fear of heaven. Why do you reveal this to flesh and blood?[15]

According to this theological material, Enoch (Metatron) is responsible for transmitting the secrets of the Written Torah as well as the Oral Tradition. "And Metatron brought them out from his house of treasuries and committed them to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue… ."[16]

In later Merkabah materials, Enoch-Metatron is the guide and the revealer of secrets to all who are initiated into the account of the Chariot.[17] Hekhalot literature (*3 Enoch*, the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials) describes these functions of Metatron. He guides and reveals secrets to R. Ishmael and to R. Akiba. Sometimes the Merkabah narrative extends his role to the titles of the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding.[18]

It is apparent that in *2 Enoch* one may see some kind of preparation of Enoch for his role as Metatron, "the Knower of Secrets." The preparation entails several stages. First, the archangel Vereveil inducts Enoch into these secrets. He instructs Enoch in "all the deeds of the Lord, the earth and the sea, and all the elements and the courses…and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn" (23:1–2). Second, the Lord himself continues to instruct him in the secrets, which he had not even explained to the angels (24:3). Finally, the Lord promised Enoch the role of "Knower of Secrets." The important detail here is that the promise of the role is closely connected with other titles of Metatron such as the Prince of Presence, the Heavenly Scribe, and the Witness of the Judgment. In the text the Lord promised:

---

[15] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.177–178.

[16] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.178.

[17] Metatron himself was the Merkabah mystic *par excellence* and a good example for *Yorde Merkabah*. As Alexander notes, it is not hard to see why he attracted mystics. "He was a human being who had been elevated over all the angels, and was living proof that man could overcome angelic opposition and approach God. He was a powerful 'friend at court.'" Alexander, "3 Enoch," *OTP*, 1.244.

[18] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.30.

> …and you will be in front of my face from now and forever.[19] And you will be seeing my secrets[20] and you will be scribe for my servants[21] since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment[22] of the great age (36:3).

This substantial passage graphically depicts the interrelation of the future roles of Enoch-Metatron in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. In spite of the fact that the text does not elaborate the real embodiments of these roles and titles, but only promises and initiations in these roles, it leaves the impression that *2 Enoch* is part of larger tradition and that its author has prior knowledge of the future development of these titles and the deeds behind them.

It is intriguing that the narrative of *2 Enoch* does not show the promised powerful deeds of Enoch-Metatron in different offices of the heavenly realm, for example, those of the Knower, the Scribe, the Witness and the Prince of Presence even in early "primitive" Merkabah or apocalyptic form. It looks as if the author of the text deliberately avoids these details. He knows that it is not time for revealing these facts. Enoch must return to the earth, and only after that trip he will fully assume his heavenly offices. In 67:2, which serves as the conclusion to Enoch's story, there is a statement about the theme: "and the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity."[23]

In this regard, the narratives of *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* seem to be written from different temporal perspectives. The setting of Enoch's story in *2 Enoch* is the antediluvian period. Melchizedek's narrative of the book distinctively stresses this point. This explains why in *2 Enoch* "there is no place for Abraham, Moses, and the rest."[24]

---

[19] "The Prince of Presence."
[20] "The Knower of Secrets."
[21] "The Heavenly Scribe."
[22] "The Witness of the Divine Judgment."
[23] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 195.
[24] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 196.

The Heavenly Scribe

Odeberg notices that Enoch's initiation into the Secrets (and his title—the Knower of Secrets) is closely connected with his scribal activities[25] and with his other title—"the Scribe"[26] (סופר) or "the Heavenly Scribe."[27] The steps in the development of this theme in *2 Enoch* are apparent. Enoch's scribal functions have several aspects:

1. He was initiated into the scribal activities by the Lord himself. "And the Lord said to Vereveil, 'Bring out the books from the storehouses, and give a pen to Enoch[28] and read him the books.' And Vereveil…gave me the pen[29] from his hand" (22:11).[30]
2. He writes down the mysteries which were explained to him by angels. In 23:4 angel Vereveil commands him: "Write everything that I have explained to you."[31]
3. The results of his scribal activity were a certain number of books. "I wrote accurately. And I expounded 300 and 60 books" (23:6).[32]
4. The Lord instructed Enoch to deliver these books in his handwriting to his sons,[33] and to distribute the books in his handwriting to his children … for they will read them from generation to generation (33:8–10).

---

[25] In early Enochic traditions these two functions are also unified. The motif of initiation into the secrets as the beginning of scribal activities occupies a substantial role in the Astronomical Book of *1 Enoch*, the oldest Enochic material. In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrects of heavenly bodies and their movements. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as "the scribe of distinction" ספר פרשא. Cf. Milik, *The Book of Enoch*, 261–262 and 305. In the book of *Jubilees* Enoch is attested as "the first who learned writings and knowledge and wisdom… And who wrote in the book the signs of the heaven." O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees," *OTP*, 2.62.

[26] The origin of the title in Enochic traditions can be traced to the *Book of the Watchers* of *1 Enoch* 12:4, 15:1, where Enoch is named as "a scribe of rightousness." Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 92 and 100. According to Black the possible biblical parallel to Enoch's role as the Scribe could be the passage from Ezek. 9, which pictures man clad in white linen with an ink-horn by his side. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 143.

[27] Odebert, *3 Enoch*, 1.56.

[28] **вдаи же трость Ѳнохови.**

[29] **вдасть ми трость.**

[30] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 141.

[31] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 141.

[32] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 141.

[33] In *1 Enoch* 81:6 the angel Uriel commands to Enoch "teach your children, and write (these things) down for them, and testify to all your children." Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.187.

5. The Lord appointed the guardian angels for Enoch's writings:

   For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers—Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33:10–12.)[34]

   The motif of guardian angels of the books is very specific for the esoterism of Merkabah tradition.[35] This motif can be found in *3 Enoch* as well as in other texts of the tradition.
6. Finally the Lord gave the promise to Enoch about his future role as the Heavenly Scribe when he will return to heaven after the instructions of his sons, "…and you will be the scribe[36] for my servants, since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment of the great age" (36:3).[37]

Finally, it is worth examining an interesting detail that is relevant as a characteristic of a hypothetical provenance, but which has remained unnoticed by scholars. In 23:4, when Enoch was already in the highest realms, Vereveil gave him permission to sit down.[38] "You sit down; write everything… ." And Enoch said, "And I sat down[39] for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately" (23:6).[40] It

[34] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 157.

[35] Alexander notes that "classic rabbinical literature makes it clear that there was an esoteric doctrine in Talmudic Judaism. It was concerned with two subjects—the Account of Creation (*Ma'aseh Berešit*) and the Account of the Chariot (*Ma'aseh Merkabah*). All study and discussion of these topics in public was banned." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 229–230.

[36] **книжник.**

[37] It is an important moment for understanding of the presence of Merkabah tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*: the functions of Enoch as the Scribe will be connected with his role as the Witness of the Divine Judgment: "Metatron sits and judges the heavenly household" or "Metatron, the angel of the Presence, stands at the door of the Palace of God and he sits and judges all the heavenly hosts before his Master. And God pronounces judgment and he executes it." Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.171.

[38] **сѧди.**

[39] **сѣдохъ.**

[40] Andersen, "*2 Enoch*," 141.

is important to notice that Vereveil's suggestion that Enoch be seated occurs after Enoch has been "brought in front of the face of the Lord" (22:6), and after he has been invited by the Lord "to stand in front of his face forever" (22.6–7). According to rabbinic tradition, "there is no sitting in heaven."[41] An allegorical description, which can be found in *3 Enoch*, depicts God as the one who places Metatron on a throne at the door of the Seventh Hall.[42] In his commentary on this section of *3 Enoch*, Odeberg states that "assigning a seat or a throne to any angel-prince or to any one beside the Holy One, might endanger the recognition of the absolute sovereignty and unity of the Godhead."[43] Furthermore, he reasoned that according to rabbinic tradition the privilege of "sitting" was accorded to Metatron by virtue of his character as "scribe," for he was granted permission as a scribe "to sit and write down the merits of Israel."[44] This fact, that Enoch was seated in the text of *2 Enoch*, is one more compelling example that further strengthens the hypothesis regarding the connection of the text of *2 Enoch* with the Merkabah tradition.

The Youth

Previous research has shown that the descriptions of the celestial titles in *2 Enoch* occupy some sort of intermediate position between early Enochic traditions and the Metatron tradition. Therefore, some later titles of Metatron, which are absent in *1 Enoch, Jubilees* and Qumran materials are presented in the narrative of *2 Enoch.* A good illustration of this situation could be the observation of another celestial title of Enoch-Metatron which can be found in *2 Enoch*, namely—*Na'ar* **נער**, which can be translated as the Youth or the Lad.[45]

According to Jewish mystical lore, this title could be considered as "proof" of the theological assumption that Metatron is the translated Enoch ben Yared. The tradition derives this title from the exegesis of

---

[41] *b.* Hag. 15a.
[42] 3 En. 10.
[43] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.27.
[44] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.27.
[45] According to Tishby it is the most popular title of Metatron. "Metatron is known by many names and titles, but his regular designation, found even in the earlier literature, is **נער**, *na'ar*—"boy," or "lad." I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994), 2.628.

Prov. 22.6 (חנך לנער), which was interpreted as "Enoch was made into the *Na'ar*, i.e. Metatron."[46]

The title "Youth" in the Merkabah tradition has several possible theological meanings. According to one of them, the name may be explained by the fact that Metatron grows old, and is then constantly rejuvenated.[47] Another possible explanation is that he is young in comparison with other angels-princes who existed from the beginning.[48] It is notable, that the several important occurrences of the title "Youth" in the text of *2 Enoch* come from the mouths of angels. In chapter 9 of the short recension an angelic being, who is accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm, addresses Enoch as "Youth": "This place has been prepared, Youth (ѭношє), for the righteous… .[49] Later in chapter 10 we can hear the same address again: "This place, Youth (ѭношє), has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth…"[50] These occurrences could be considered by someone simply as reminders for Enoch about his novice status in the heavenly realm. This, however, is not the case with the Merkabah tradition, where *Na'ar* also designates special relationships between the Holy One and Metatron. In *3 Enoch* when R. Ishmael asks Metatron "What is your name?" Metatron answers, "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy tongues of the world… but my King calls me 'Youth' (*Na'ar*)."[51] Interestingly enough, we can see the beginning of this tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*. In chapter 24 of the short recension[52] we read: "And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And the Lord spoke to me 'Whatever you see, Youth (ѭношє), things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me. And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets… as I am making them known to you today.'"[53] As we can see

[46] Odebert, *3 Enoch*, 1.119.

[47] Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2.628: "it is the mystery of the boy who reaches old age and then reverts to his youth as at the beginning."

[48] Odebert, *3 Enoch*, 1.80.

[49] Barsov's manuscript [B], ch. V in M.I. Sokolov, "Slavyanskaja kniga Enoha pravednogo: Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie," *Chtenija v obshchestve istorii i drevnostej Rossiiskih* 4 (1910), 85.

[50] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 119.

[51] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.6–7.

[52] On Merkabah stratum of the shorter recension see A. Orlov, *"Merkabah Stratum" of the Short Recension of 2 Enoch* (M.A. Thesis; Abilene: Abilene Christian University, 1995).

[53] Barsov's manuscript [B], ch. XI in M.I. Sokolov, "Slavyanskaja kniga Enoha

in the passage the title "Youth" stresses the unique role of Enoch-Metatron among other archangels-princes, despite his young angelic age.

In spite of the abundance of the information about *Na'ar* in Merkabah literature, the title itself, in many respects, remains a mysterious theological puzzle. Perhaps the most mysterious thing connected with this title is the fact that prominent scholars of Jewish mystical literature like Scholem and Odeberg do not find the important title in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. One possible explanation may be that Vaillant did not pay enough attention to the variants of the reading of the term "Youth" in his edition, considering this reading as a "corruption,"[54] and consequently dedicating just a few sentences to this fact. According to Vaillant this "corruption" occurred because the Slavonic word **Ѳноше**, the vocative form of "Enoch," is very similar to "Youth," **юноше**.[55] This probably explains why those scholars who based their research on Vaillant's text also missed this vital point. Only the new collation of manuscripts for Andersen's translation again drew attention to this variant. Andersen gives a short concluding note on the term "Youth" that "It cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*."[56]

The Governor of the World

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as "governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth."[57] Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World **שר העולם**, the leader of seventy-two princes of the kingdom of the world, who speaks

---

pravednogo: Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie," *Chtenija v obshchestve istorii i drevnostej Rossiiskih* 4 (1910), 90–91.

[54] Andersen criticizes Valliant's position. He stresses that "the similarity to the vocative *enoše* might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to ju; *junokhu* is never found." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 118–119.

[55] Cf. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, 8.

[56] Andersen, "*2 Enoch*," 119. Sreznevskij's dictionary equates the Slavonic word **юноше** with Greek νεανίσκος. Cf. I.I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989), 2.1627–1628.

[57] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 1.81.

(pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One.[58] Odeberg notes that "the Prince of the World in *3 Enoch* combines the function of the rulers of the nations: they plead each one the cause of his nation, the Prince of the World pleads the cause of all nations together, of the world in its entirety."[59]

Both chapter 43 of the short recension of *2 Enoch* and a similar passage of the text of *2 Enoch* in a Slavonic collection "The Just Balance"[60] reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. The texts outline Enoch's instructions to his children during his brief return to the earth in which he mentions his new role as the Governor of the earth:

> And behold my children, I am the Governor[61] of the earth, I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day.[62] And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded…the doings of each person will put down, and no one will hide, because the Lord is the one who pays, and He will be the avenger on the great judgment day.[63]

The interesting parallel here to *3 Enoch* is the fact that the role of Enoch-Metatron as the Governor (Prince) of the World is closely connected in both texts with the theme of Divine Judgment and with Metatron's role in that process as the Witness of the Judgment.[64] As we recall in

---

[58] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.105. In chapter 48 of *3 Enoch* the Holy One says that he "committed unto him (Metatron) 70 angels corresponding to the nations (of the world) and gave into his charge all the household above and below … and arranged for him all the works of Creation," Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.166.

[59] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.105.

[60] "The Just Balance" (*Merilo Pravednoe*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of *2 Enoch* first was made public. Cf. M.N. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

[61] Majority of manuscripts use Slavonic words **кръмствоуемаꙗ** or **кормствоуемаꙗ**. I. Sreznevskij in his dictionary relates these Slavonic terms to the Greek word κυβέρνησις or the Latin *gubernatio*. Cf. I.I. Sreznevskij, *Stovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka*, 1.1410. The manuscripts of "*Merilo Pravednoe*" [MPr] use the word *pravlemaya*. Cf. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka*, 71. Andersen translates the term as "manager"—"I am the manager of the arrangements on earth…." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217.

[62] See the similar functions of Enoch in the *Book of Jubilees* where he "appointed times of the years according to their order, with respect to each of their months.… And their weeks according to jubilees he recounted; and the days of the years he made known. And the months he set in order, and the sabbaths of the years he recounted," Wintermute, "Jubilees," 62–63.

[63] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217–219.

[64] The rudimentary traces of this tradition can be found in other documents of early Enochic literature: in *1 Enoch*, *Aramaic Levi*, and in the *Book of Jubilees*, where Enoch is pictured as the one "who saw what was and what will happen among the children of

3 Enoch these two themes—governing of the world and pleading for the world—remained connected together: Metatron is the Prince of the World "who pleads in the favor of the world." The narrative of *2 Enoch* has a similar pattern—the title of Governor in this context means "the Mediator of Divine Judgment"[65]—Enoch pleads before the Lord for the world while reminding the world about the Divine Judgment.

Another interesting point about this material is the fact that the passage which is dedicated to the description of Enoch's role as "Governor of the World" is incorporated into a part of the book that is directly connected with other descriptions of the titles of Enoch. My previous observations about the celestial titles of Enoch showed that these descriptions are situated in chapters 21–38. These early chapters unfold Enoch's transformation from a human being into an angel in the highest celestial realms near the Throne of Glory.

In chapters 39–67, Enoch gives some instructions to his children during his brief visit to the earth. The text makes clear that during this visit Enoch is already an angelic being. In chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* he says to his son: "Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food."[66] This portrayal of Enoch as angelic being in this section of the book is very important, because it allows us to see traces of another tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*. It is possible that in this part of the book we have some remnants of developed Metatron tradition. Chapters 39–67 differ slightly from chapters 21–38 in the ways the picture Enoch's role in the celestial realm.

First, the later chapters (43–44) give an important description of Enoch as the Governor (Prince) of the world, a role which in late Merkabah literature usually is connected with Metatron tradition.

---

men in their generations until the day of judgment. He saw and knew everything and wrote his testimony and deposited the testimony upon the earth against all the children of men and their generation … And he wrote everything, and bore witness to the Watchers …. And Enoch bore witness against all of them … And behold, he is there writing condemnation and judgement of the world, and all of the evils of the children of men." Wintermute, "Jubilees," 62.

[65] See *Jub.* 4:24 "…he (Enoch) was put there for a sign and so that he might relate all of the deeds of the generations until the day of judgment." Wintermute, "Jubilees," 63.

[66] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 183.

Second, an important aspect of the passage of chapters 43–44 is the Slavonic term **п(р)ометаıа** (*prometaya*), which follows Enoch's title, "the Governor of the World."[67] This Slavonic term is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. There is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented. Phonetically close to the term "Metatron," *prometaya* could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the name which later was transformed into the term "metatron."[68] It is noteworthy that we cannot find the term in the early chapters connected with the descriptions of other celestial titles.

Third, at the beginning of this textual block (chapter 40) we have the following words of Enoch: "Now therefore, my children, I know everything; some from the lips of the Lord, other my eyes have seen from the beginning to the end, and from the end to the recommencement."[69] This statement does not fit with previous descriptions of Enoch's initiations which were restricted by fixed temporal boundaries (angel Vereveil instructions for 30 days and 30 nights, and so on). Later, in ch. 50, Enoch says that the already "put into writing the achievements of every person, and no one can escape."[70] As we recall in his deeds as the Governor of the earth he already "arranged the whole year" and he "has distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure and every righteous scale" (43:1). This unlimited horizon of functions and deeds of Enoch is not consistent with the previous narrative of chapters 21–38. It is apparent that we have two different traditions which sometimes demonstrate the lack of linkage and reconciliation.

Finally, we must keep in mind the fact which radically differentiates *2 Enoch's* story from other stories of early Enochic documents (like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* or Enochic Qumran fragments). The important theological watershed of the Enochic and Metatron traditions in the book is the allegorical description of the extraction of Enoch from his "earthly clothing" and the placement of him into the "clothes of Glory."[71] In *2 Enoch* 22, after the archangel Michael extracted Enoch

---

[67] "And behold my children, I am the Governor of the earth, [*prometaya*], I wrote them down …"

[68] I investigated the relationships between the words *prometaya* and Metatron in my article "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26.

[69] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 165.

[70] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 177.

[71] A possible parallel to this theme could be *1 En.* 71 where Enoch "was born to righteousness." The text describes the situation when Enoch went through some sort of "transformation" when his whole body was "melted" and his spirit was transformed.

from his clothes and anointed him with the delightful oil which was "greater than the greatest light,"[72] Enoch becomes like "one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference."[73] This symbolic event of angelic[74] transmutation[75] apparently represents in many ways an important turning point in which the Enochic tradition has moved into a new era of its development—the Metatron tradition.[76]

Conclusion

As I have already mentioned, the most impressive alignments between *2 Enoch* and Merkabah tradition are dependent upon developing the themes connected with the Celestial Titles of Enoch (Metatron). They give new evidence that the Metatron tradition has deep connections with early Enochic literature.[77]

As we know, the process of the hidden theological transformation, when one name ("Enoch") suddenly becomes transformed into another name ("Metatron"), does not demonstrate the continuity of the textual tradition. On the contrary, a gap exists between the early Enochic literature (*I Enoch, Jubilees*, Enochic Qumran materials, *2 Enoch*) and the

---

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166–167. However radical difference of this transformation from the similar event in *2 Enoch* is the fact that transformed Enoch in *1 Enoch* does not belong to the archangelic rank of "glorious ones" to which Metatron belongs. The text is silent about any sign of angelic transmutation.

[72] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[73] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[74] J.H. Charlesworth rightly observes on this episode that "it is conceivable that here Enoch—although he is not explicitly called 'an angel'—has attained the rank of an angel or been transformed into angel. The possibility looms large since in *2 Enoch* 21.3 Gabriel is identified as one of the Lord's glorious ones." James H. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in: J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (SCS, 12; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980), 135–151 (147). Cf. also Scopello, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos," 377.

[75] In the Merkabah tradition we can find many parallels to this story. *3 Enoch* has the similar description of the clothing of Metatron in a garment of glory. "He made me a garment of glory on which were fixed all kinds of lights and He clad me in it." Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.32.

[76] P. Alexander notes that the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation into Metatron in *3 Enoch* 3–15. Alexander, "*3 Enoch*," 248.

[77] For a discussion of the date of *2 Enoch* in the first century CE before the destruction of the Second Temple, cf. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 17; and Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 50.

Metatron literature (the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition, *3 Enoch*). Because of the two distinct names, it appears that the two traditions are not linked. Something seems to be missing between these two great theological streams. An important scholarly task will involve finding a "bridge" that may cross this theological gap between the prerabbinic Enoch and the rabbinic Metatron. One of the links may be found in the indissoluble continuity of the titles of this main character, which are common to both traditions. The titles, like the developed images of the heavenly roles of Enoch (Metatron), help us to see the transparent theological development which lies beneath the hidden meanings of these enigmatic names.

"WITHOUT MEASURE AND WITHOUT ANALOGY": THE TRADITION OF THE DIVINE BODY IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Introduction

In one of his books[1] Gershom Scholem remarks on the origins of the terminology associated with the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials.[2] These materials depict visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba, receiving from the supreme angel Metatron revelations of the "measurement of the body" (in Hebrew, *Shi'ur Qomah*), an anthropomorphic description of the Deity together with the mystical names of its gigantic limbs.[3] Although the majority of evidence of the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition survived in late Jewish writings, Scholem argues[4] that the beginning of *Shi'ur Qomah* speculations can be dated not later than the second century CE. Scholem appeals to a passage in *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse apparently written in the first century CE, which in his opinion represents the earliest witness to the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology. The passage is situated in *2 Enoch* 39 where the antediluvian patriarch Enoch tells his children about the vision of the Lord, whom he encountered during his celestial tour. Enoch describes the appearance of the Lord as a terrifying extent analogous to the human form:

> And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal

---

[1] G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991), 29.

[2] For texts and translations of the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, see: P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1981); M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985); Schäfer et al., *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1987–1995).

[3] G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 20.

[4] Ibid., 20.

> to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into (my) eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, (my) children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord,[5] without measure and without analogy, who has no end… (*2 Enoch* 39:3–6).[6]

In his commentary on the text, Scholem draws the reader's attention to the expression "the extent of my body." He notes that earlier Abraham Kahana, in his Hebrew translation of *2 Enoch*,[7] rendered this expression as *shi'ur qomati*.[8] Scholem further suggests that despite the late date of the known rabbinic *Shi'ur Qomah* materials, the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology might be already evident in the account drawn from *2 Enoch* 39 where Enoch describes God's gigantic limbs.

Scholem's suggestions are valuable[9] and deserve serious attention, since several additional features in the aforementioned account of *2 Enoch* also seem to suggest the imagery found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition. In the Slavonic apocalypse, Enoch describes to his children the gigantic hand of the Lord which fills the heaven. This description recalls the imagery of the *Shi'ur Qomah* accounts in which Enoch-Metatron transmits to Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba knowledge about the gigantic limbs of the Deity which fill the heaven. A series of

---

[5] **ѡбьѧтиѥ Гоⷭподнѥ**. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 1.94; 2.38.

[6] F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.163.

[7] A. Kahana, "Sefer Hanok B," in: *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah* (Jerusalem, 1936f.), 102–141.

[8] Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah*, 29.

[9] Ithamar Gruenwald supports Scholem's position, suggesting that the expression found in *2 Enoch* 39 may represent the first reference to the *Shi'ur Qomah* of God. Cf. I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 213. For criticism of Scholem's position, see: M.S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (New York: University Press of America, 1983), 80.

analogies between Enoch's body and the Lord's body in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 appears also pertinent because the later Merkabah accounts often portray Enoch-Metatron as possessing the gigantic body himself. Moreover, some of these accounts seem to depict Metatron as the measure of the Divine Body.

Scholem's comments about the significance of *2 Enoch* 39 for the history of early Jewish mysticism are important. His analysis, however, is incomplete since it focuses only on the *Shi'ur Qomah* passage found in chapter 39. It does not explore the broader context of the passage, especially its relation to other descriptions of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse that seem to recall the depictions of Metatron in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. Moreover, it appears that the traditions about the divine body are not limited in this text to the figure of Enoch and include another important character of the text, namely, the patriarch Adam. The portrayal of the prelapsarian Adam found in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* reveals fascinating similarities to the later *Shi'ur Qomah* descriptions. Keeping in mind these important features of the Slavonic apocalypse, this study will investigate the roles of Adam and Enoch in the broader context of the *Shi'ur Qomah* account found in *2 Enoch*.

Adamic Tradition of 2 Enoch

Before proceeding to an investigation of the traditions about the divine body found in the Slavonic apocalypse, a short excursus into the Adamic narrative of *2 Enoch* is necessary. This narrative appears partly to be responsible for creating the polemical context in which the divine body traditions in the text are introduced and discussed.

Adam's story occupies a significant place in *2 Slavonic Enoch*. Accounts of the protoplast's creation and his fall can be found in all three major sections of the book.[10] The text depicts Adam as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a large part of the Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, a number of important passages related to this tradition are also attested in the shorter recension. The presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and the signifi-

[10] *2 Enoch* 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28.

cance of the Adamic narrative for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse lead the interpreter to conclude that they are not later interpolations, but belong to the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the early Enochic text is quite unusual. For instance, in the Enochic books, included in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, Adamic traditions are not accentuated and are limited to a few insignificant remarks.[11] Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic Apocalypse. *1 Enoch's* materials do not provide any information about the elevated status of the protoplast.

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic books can be explained by the fact that Enochic and Adamic traditions often contend with each other in offering different explanations of the origin of evil[12] in the world.[13] From the point of view of this rivalry between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the concentrated presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions interpolated into the original narrative much later during its long transmission in the Christian environment. A closer examination of the text, however, reveals that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is neither secondary nor coincidental but has a profound conceptual value for the overall theology of the pseudepigraphon. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more developed than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, the Enochic tradition tries to portray the patriarch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch (very different from the early Enochic literature) which

---

[11] See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9–11; 85:3; 90:37–38.

[12] The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

[13] M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149; J.C. Reeves, *Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, "the Prince of the Presence."[14] It is therefore possible that the traditions about the exalted status of Adam were introduced in *2 Enoch*, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, in order to enhance the new profile of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[15]

The elevated prelapsarian condition of the protoplast as the archetype of exalted humanity appears to serve in the Slavonic apocalypse as a model for constructing the new super-angelic identity of Enoch.[16] In *2 Enoch* the seventh antediluvian patriarch acquired a host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. One of these transferences includes the tradition of Adam's cosmic body that seems to play a formative role in creating such new identities of Enoch as the *measure* and the *measurer* of the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse.

---

[14] Philip Alexander observes that "the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 248.

[15] In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research deals mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrates that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory, which was lost during the protoplast's transgression. Idel suggests that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis attested in *2 Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observes that to the best of his knowledge "Enoch is the only living person for whom we learn that luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made." M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), 220–240. Alexander, in his recent research, adds new insight to Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic traditions for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the "supernatural radiance" of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, then returned to be reincarnated in Enoch. He further observes that "behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels…. Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure—a second Adam through whom humanity is restored." Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 111.

[16] Christfried Böttrich, in his recent book *Adam als Mikrokosmos* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995), attempted to investigate the Adamic traditions about the protoplast's creation out of the seven components and the correspondence of his name with the four corners of the world found in *2 Enoch* 30. Unfortunately, Böttrich's research completely ignored the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in *2 Enoch* and its formative value for the elevated image of Enoch in this text. As a consequence Böttrich failed to uncover the function of the Adamic tradition in the

The Corporeality of the Protoplast

The later Jewish materials associated with the Merkabah tradition often depict Enoch-Metatron as the one who possesses a corporeal structure of cosmic dimensions. One of such testimonies can be found, for example, in *3 Enoch* 9,[17] which describes the transformation of the patriarch Enoch into the supreme angel Metatron. According to this text, during this celestial metamorphosis Enoch-Metatron "was enlarged and increased in size till [he] matched the world in length and breadth."[18] The materials associated with the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition[19] also describe Enoch-Metatron in similar terms, telling that "the stature of this youth fills the world[20] (**והנער הזה קומתו מלא העולם**)."[21]

Despite the prominent place that the traditions about the cosmic body of Enoch-Metatron occupy in the later Merkabah accounts, the early Enochic materials of the Second Temple period are silent about the great dimensions of the body of the elevated patriarch. The Enochic traditions attested in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants* do not provide any hints about Enoch's gigantic body. In contrast to this silence about Enoch's corporeality, several early Jewish sources attest to the lore about the enormous body of another Biblical character, the patriarch Adam, which the protoplast possessed before his transgression in Eden. Thus, Philo in *QG* 1.32 unveils a tradition according to which "[the first humans] … were provided with a very great body and the magnitude of a giant… ."[22] A similar testimony can

---

larger theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse and to discern the proper meaning in the polemical context of the divine body traditions in *2 Enoch*.

[17] See also: *3 Enoch* 48C:5–6: "I increased his stature (**קומתו**) by seventy thousand parasangs, above every height, among those who are tall of stature (**בכל רומי הקומות**). I magnified his throne from the majesty of my throne. I increased his honor from the glory of my honor. I turned his flesh to fiery torches and all the bones of his body (**גופו**) to coals of light. I made the appearance of his eyes like the appearance of lightning, and the light of his eyes like 'light unfailing.' I caused his face to shine like the brilliant light of the sun." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 312; Schäfer *et al.*, *Synopse*, 36–37.

[18] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 263.

[19] Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 159. Cf. also Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 162.

[20] "His body is 30,000,000 parasangs, and they call him, 'Lad.'" Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 40–41.

[21] Schäfer et al, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 162.

[22] Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis* (tr. R. Marcus; Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press/Heinemann, 1949), 19.

be found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish text written around the first century CE. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23:4–6 relates the description of the terrifying corporalities of the protoplasts:

> And I looked at the picture, and my eyes ran to the side of the garden of Eden. And I saw there a man very great in height and terrible in breadth, incomparable in aspect, entwined with a woman was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under the tree of Eden… .[23]

Moreover, in some pseudepigraphical accounts the body of the protoplast is portrayed, not simply as gigantic, but even as comparable with the dimensions of the divine corporeality. Thus, in several pseudepigraphical materials the depictions of Adam's stature are often linked to the imagery of the enthroned divine anthropomorphic extent known from the priestly and Ezekelian sources as God's *Kavod*. One such association might be hinted at in *2 Enoch* 30; here the *Kavod* imagery seems to have been applied to Adam's prelapsarian condition. In this text the protoplast is labeled as "the second angel" to whom the Lord assigned four special stars. Jarl Fossum suggests[24] that, in view of the imagery attested in another Enochic texts where stars often designate angels, the allotment to Adam of the "four special stars" might allude to the fact that Adam, like God, also has his own "Princes of the Presence"—the four angels whose function is to serve near the Throne of Glory. This angelic imagery signals that *2 Enoch*'s authors might understand Adam as an enthroned entity resembling the Lord's glorious anthropomorphic extent, his *Kavod*.[25]

The *Testament of Abraham* 11:4 (Recension A) also attests to a similar tradition when it offers a depiction of "the first-formed Adam" seated on the throne at the entrance to paradise at the end of time: "And outside the two gates of that place, they saw a man seated on the golden throne. And the appearance of that man was terrifying, like

---

[23] R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.700.

[24] J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1996), 1.535, n. 39.

[25] Further support for the suggestion that in *2 Enoch* Adam is enthroned is offered in that the text says that the Lord created open heaven in order that Adam might look upon the angels singing the triumphal song. This detail again recalls the traditional *Kavod* imagery where the angelic hosts sing the triumphal song before the enthroned King.

the Master's."[26] Here again Adam is depicted as a resemblance of the Lord's *Kavod*, the divine form manifested on the Seat of Glory.[27]

It is intriguing that in Georgian, Armenian and Latin versions of the primary Adam books,[28] the protoplast is depicted as a being venerated by angelic hosts.[29] The tradition about the angelic veneration of the protoplast might also point to associations with the *Kavod* tradition in which one of the essential functions of angelic hosts in the celestial realm is veneration of the enthroned divine Glory.

The heterodox movements in early Christianity that are closely associated with Sethian and Adamic traditions also contain several important testimonies about Adam's body pertaining to the subject of our investigation.[30] Some of these accounts recall the imagery found in the later Merkabah accounts. Thus, the *Apocryphon of John* relates a tradition according to which the seven powers were responsible for the creation of the seven souls of Adam.[31] The text relates that the seven powers provided for the angels the seven substances of the soul in order to create the proportions of the limbs of Adam.[32] In the *Apocryphon* each of the limbs of the first man corresponds to the name of the angel responsible for its creation.[33] The detailed attention to the limbs of the first man and their naming according to angelic connotations seem to recall the later *Shi'ur Qomah* materials with their tendency to name the

---

[26] E. Sanders, "Testament of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.888.

[27] On the traditions of Adam's enthronement, see: B. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSS, 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 87–90.

[28] Cf. Georgian, Armenian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13:2–14:2.

[29] Michael Stone recently demonstrated that one of the earliest instances of this tradition can be found in *2 Enoch* 22 where Enoch is transformed after the glory of God into a glorious angelic being venerated by angels. Stone points to the original Adamic mytheme behind this Enochic imagery. M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 47.

[30] Cf. for example: Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1.30.6 "Ialdabaoth exclaimed, 'Come, let us make man after our image.' The six powers, on hearing this … jointly formed a man of immense size, both in regard to breadth and length."

[31] *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and VI, 1 with BG 8502, 2* (eds. M. Waldstein and F. Wisse; NMS, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 88–91.

[32] Ibid., 93.

[33] Ibid., 95–111.

various parts of the cosmic body and for providing the detailed depictions of its limbs.[34]

All these early testimonies demonstrate that long before the traditions about the gigantic physique of Enoch-Metatron took their distinctive mold in the Merkabah tradition, a similar imagery was already applied in the Jewish pseudepigrapha and the Christian apocrypha to Adam's prelapsarian corporeality. As already mentioned, earlier scholars proposed that the Adamic imagery played a formative role in the shaping of the Metatron tradition. It is also possible that the concept of the cosmic body of the protoplast played a formative role in constructing the later Metatron's office as the measurer of the divine body. The beginning of this significant development might be detected already in *2 Enoch*. In order to support this hypothesis, our investigation will proceed in the following manner. First, we will explore in detail the tradition of Adam's body in the Slavonic apocalypse. Then, we will focus on the theme of Enoch's corporeality in the text. Finally, we will try to establish the relationship between both traditions in their connections with the motif of the Lord's *Shi'ur Qomah* found in chapter 39.

From the Four Corners of the World

According to *2 Enoch* 30:12, the prelapsarian Adam was a very special celestial being. The Slavonic apocalypse defines him as a second angel who was great (Slav. **великъ**) and glorious. The Slavonic terminology used for the term "great" (**великъ**) appears to be related to the physical dimensions of the protoplast. *2 Enoch* 30:10 provides additional proof that the greatness might designate Adam's proportions. In this passage the Lord says that "even at his [Adam's] greatest (**въ величѣ**) he is small, and again at his smallest he is great."[35] The conjunction of the term "great" with the term "small" further supports the hypothesis that the epithet "greatness" in the text is applied to the dimensions of the first human.

Besides these general references to the "greatness" of Adam, the text also provides other hints about the dimensions of the patriarch's body. It appears that the most important evidences about the unusual

[34] Cf. G.G. Stroumsa, "Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème: l'Apocryphon de Jean et ses sources," *VC* 35 (1988) 412–434.

[35] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 152.

frame of the protoplast in the Slavonic apocalypse are conveyed via the traditions about the creation and the naming of the protoplast.

In *2 Enoch* 30:13 the Lord tells Enoch that he created Adam out of the seven components and assigned to Adam a name from the four "components:" from East—(A), from West—(D), from North—(A), and from South—(M).[36] The correspondence of the anagram of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth might indicate that the dimensions of his body are considered identical with the size of the earth. The Slavonic text, however, does not make this connection explicitly. Moreover, the question remains if this passage about the anagram is really linked to the traditions about Adam's body. The analysis of the early evidences of the anagram's motif shows that this theme was often connected with the theme of Adam's bodily form. In order to illustrate this point, a short excursus in the history of this tradition is needed.

One of the early Jewish texts where a similar[37] tradition about the anagram can be found is the third book of *Sibylline Oracles*, a composition apparently written in Egypt around 160–150 BCE.[38] It is intriguing that already in the *Sibylline Oracles* 3:24–27[39] the anagram is linked to the motif of Adam's bodily form: "Indeed it is God himself who fashioned Adam, of four letters, the first-formed man, fulfilling by his name east and west and south and north. He himself fixed the shape of the form of men (αὐτὸς δ' ἐστήριξε τύπον μορφῆς μερόπων)."[40] The term "shape of the form" (τύπος μορφῆς) here seems to be related to the body of the protoplast. The conflation of the anagram of Adam's name with the shape of his form is significant for our investigation.[41]

---

[36] The letters of this anagram correspond to Gk. ἀνατολή, δύσις, ἄρκτος, and μεσημβρία.

[37] The *Sibylline Oracles* have a slightly different sequence of the "corners": east-west-south-north.

[38] J.J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.355–356.

[39] John Collins observes that *Sibylline Oracles* 3:1–45 "finds its closest parallels in the Jewish Orphic fragments, which probably date to the second century B.C., and also in Philo." Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," 360.

[40] Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," 362; *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (ed. A.-M. Kurfess; Berlin: Heimeren, 1951), 72.

[41] *Vita Adae et Evae* 27:1 also connects Adam's name with "the memory of the divine majesty." This expression might serve to designate Adam's glorious form, which represents "memory" or likeness of the divine form: "… My Lord, Almighty and merciful God, holy and faithful, do not let the name of the memory of your majesty be destroyed (*ne deleatur nomen memoriae tuae maiestatis*)." *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and*

Another Egyptian source,[42] a passage found in the writings of the Hermetic author, the alchemist Zosimos of Panopolis who lived in Alexandria in the late third or early fourth century CE,[43] also connects the tradition about the anagram of Adam's name with his body:[44] " … they have also spoken of him [Adam] symbolically, *according to his body*, through the four elements … for his 'alpha' element indicates the east, the air, while his 'delta' element indicates the west, and the 'mu' element [indicates] midday. …"[45]

It should be noted that the *Sibylline Oracles* 3 and the Zosimos passage, the two early attestations which link the anagram of Adam's name with his body, are both associated with the Egyptian milieu. A passage from Philo mentioned in our previous investigation indicates that by the first century CE the lore about the gigantic physique of the first humans appeared to be widespread in the Alexandrian environment. *2 Enoch*, which also contains a host of traditions pertaining to the protoplast's body, might have been also composed at the same time and place, namely, in the Alexandrian Diaspora of the first century CE.

The tradition in which the anagram of Adam's name was associated with his body was not lost in the melting pot of the Alexandrian environment but was carefully transmitted by later Jewish traditions. The same tendency to link the name of Adam derived from the Greek designations of the four corners of the world with his body is observable in the rabbinic materials. The difference between the early accounts found in the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos of Panopolis and these rabbinic materials is that the latter explicitly identify the anagram, not simply with Adam's body, but with his cosmic body, which according

---

Eve. Second Revised Edition (eds. G.A. Anderson and M.E. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 32–32E.

[42] It is significant that the *Sibylline Oracles* and the Zosimos passage are both connected with the Egyptian environment, a place of possible provenance of *2 Enoch*. One should also note that the aforementioned research of C. Böttrich also refers to the passages from the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos. Böttrich, however, did not recognize them as a chain of references to the body of the protoplast. Cf. Böttrich, *Adam als Microkosmos*, 23–27.

[43] A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, Vol. I. L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983), 239.

[44] Cf. B.A. Pearson, "Enoch in Egypt," in: *For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (eds. R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow, and R.A. Werline; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 222.

[45] For the Greek text, see: M.E. Berthelot/Ch.-Ém. Ruelle, *Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs* (2 vols.; Paris: Georges Steinheil, 1888), 2.231.

to the rabbinic accounts was created "from one end of the universe to the other." This tradition is attested in a great variety of the rabbinic sources.

For example, the passage from *Gen. R.* 8:1 reads:

> R. Tanhuma in the name of R. Banayah and R. Berekiah in the name of R. Leazar said: He created him [Adam] as a lifeless mass extending from one end of the world to the other; thus it is written, Thine eyes did not see mine unformed substance (Ps. CXXXIX, 16). R. Joshua b. R. Nehemiah and R. Judah b. R. Simon in R. Leasar's name said: He created him filling the whole world. How do we know [that he stretched] from *east to west*? Because it is said, "Thou hast formed me behind and before." From *north to south*? Because it says, Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from the one end of heaven unto the other (Deut. IV, 32). And how do we know that he filled the empty spaces of the world? From the verse, "And laid Thy hand upon me" (as you read, Withdraw Thy hand from me (Job XIII, 21)).[46]

This passage indicates that the speculations about the cosmic body of the protoplast in the rabbinic literature were juxtaposed with the tradition about the correspondence of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth. It is remarkable that the passage from *Gen. R.* 8:1 has exactly the same "sequence" of the corners as *2 Enoch*, namely "from east (A) to west (D)" and from "north (A) to south (M)," which precisely corresponds to the sequence of the letters of Adam's name. The presence of the anagram in the midrashic text points to its ancient Hellenistic origin since the anagram does not carry any meaning in Hebrew, but only in Greek. This tradition about the correspondence of Adam's cosmic body with the four corners of the world and the four letters of his name was widespread in rabbinic literature and was repeated multiple times in *Gen. R.* 21:3, *Gen. R.* 24:2, *Lev. R.* 14:1, and *Lev. R.* 18:2. It is significant that all these passages have the same order of the corners of the world: from east to west and from north to south. A similar tradition can be also found in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* where the motif of Adam's gigantic body created from the four corners of the world is conflated with the story of the veneration of the protoplast by the creatures who mistakenly perceived him as a deity.[47]

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11 reads:

---

[46] *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; trs. H. Freedman and M. Simon; London: Soncino, 1939), 1.54–55.

[47] The importance of this motif for *2 Enoch's* traditions will be discussed later.

> He [God] began to collect the dust of the first man from the four corners of the world… He [Adam] stood on his feet and was adorned with the Divine Image. His height was from east to west, as it is said, "Thou hast beset me behind and before." "Behind" refers to the west, "before" refers to the east. All the creatures saw him and became afraid of him, thinking that he was their Creator, and they came to prostrate themselves before him.[48]

In the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* 6–12, the same tradition is repeated in a virtually identical form:

> …God then called Gabriel, and said unto him: "Go and bring Me dust from the four corners of the earth, and I will create man out of it"… He [Adam] stood upon his feet, and was in the likeness of God; his height extended from the east to the west, as it is said, "Behind and in front Thou hast formed me." Behind, that is the west, and in front, that is the east. All creatures saw him and were afraid of him; they thought he was their creator, and prostrated themselves before him.[49]

The testimonies from *Midrash Rabbah*, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* demonstrate that in the Jewish materials the anagram tradition was consistently interpreted as a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast, created from one end of the universe to the other. In light of this tendency, it is possible that the tradition about the anagram found in *2 Enoch* 30 also represents a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast. This suggestion is made more plausible when one considers that the anagram tradition in *2 Enoch* 30:13 follows immediately after the definition of the protoplast as a great celestial creature.[50]

---

[48] *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (tr. G. Friedländer; New York: Hermon Press, 1965), 76–79.

[49] *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899), 14–17.

[50] Another tradition found in chapter 30 about the creation of Adam from the seven components might also serve as an allusion to the cosmic body of the protoplast. The description found in *2 Enoch* 30:8 relates that Adam's flesh was created from earth; his blood from dew and from the sun; his eyes from the bottomless sea; his bones from stone; his reason from the mobility of angels and from clouds; his veins and hair from the grass of the earth; his spirit from the Lord's spirit and from wind. It is possible that by such postulations the text intends to stress that the primordial Adam was the creature of macrocosmic dimensions since Adam's creation from the seven elements refers to Adam as a microcosm, e.g. the anthropomorphic representation of the world. The motif of creation from the seven elements might also be linked to the traditions associated with *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism. The previously mentioned passage from the *Apocryphon of John*, where the *seven* powers create the seven "souls" of Adam might shed additional light on *2 Enoch's* account of Adam's creation from the *seven* elements.

The Measure of the Divine Body

As has been already mentioned in the introduction, *2 Enoch* 39 depicts the Lord's body as a huge extent "without measure and without analogy." While the text unambiguously states that the Lord's extent transcends any analogy, the account of Enoch's vision of the Lord seems in itself to represent a set of analogies in which the descriptions of the patriarch's face and the parts of the Lord's body are compared with the descriptions of the divine face and the parts of the Lord's body.

Several details in this narrative are important for establishing the connection between *2 Enoch's* account and the later Jewish traditions about the divine body.

1. It is significant that, through the analogical descriptions introduced in chapter 39 for the first time in the Enochic tradition, a significant bond was established between the immense body of the Lord and Enoch's body; this bond will later play a prominent role in Merkabah mysticism. In *2 Enoch*, as with later Merkabah developments, the proximity between the two bodies appears also to be reinforced by additional metaphors. These metaphors are intended to demonstrate the closeness between the corporeality of the Deity and the Enoch-Metatron corporeality.[51] From the Merkabah materials one can learn that "the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron."[52] In *2 Enoch* 39:5 the patriarch uses a similar metaphor when he tells his children that he has seen the right hand of the Lord helping (beckoning)[53] him.[54]

2. In the Merkabah materials the divine corporeality is labeled as the Measure of the Body[55] (שיעור קומה). The same terminology is often applied to Enoch-Metatron's body. According to one of the Merk-

---

[51] Ithamar Gruenwald observes that "it is hard to say whether any method lies behind these measures, but we assume that originally the measures aimed at conveying the notion of ideal proportions. These proportions were shared by God and man alike." Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 214.

[52] *Synopse* §384.

[53] The same imagery can be found in Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* 72: "Upon it sat a man of noble mien, becrowned, and with a scepter in one hand while with the other he did beckon me…." R.G. Robertson, "Ezekiel the Tragedian," *OTP*, 1.812.

[54] Cf. also *2 Enoch* 24:2 (the shorter recension). "And the Lord called me; and he placed me to the left of himself closer than Gabriel." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 143.

[55] G. Scholem observes that the term *qomah* was often translated as "height" ("Measurement of the Height"), used in the Biblical sense. He stresses that such translation

abah texts, "the stature (קומתו) of this youth fills the world."[56] The link between the body of the patriarch and the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse is also emphasized by identical terminology. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that in *2 Enoch* the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology is applied, not only to the body of the Lord (the stature[57] of the Lord), but also to the body of the patriarch (stature of my [Enoch's] body).

3. In *2 Enoch* 39, Enoch's body seems to serve as the measure and the analogy through which the patriarch conveys to his children the immeasurability of the Lord's stature. In *2 Enoch* 39:6 the term *without measure*[58] (Slav. **бєзмѣрно**) is used immediately after the expression "the *stature*[59] of the Lord."[60] This conflation of the concepts of "stature" and "measure" further strengthens G. Scholem's hypothesis that *2 Enoch* 39 might attest to the precise *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology, since the term **שיעור** can be translated as a measure.[61]

4. It is also important that the message about the impossibility of measuring[62] the Lord's body comes from the mouth of Enoch, depicted in various sections of *2 Enoch* as a measurer responsible for measuring

---

does not apply to the Merkabah materials where *qomah*, like in the Aramaic incantation texts, signifies "body." Cf. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 364.

[56] Schäfer *et al.*, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 162.

[57] Slav. **ѡбѣтїа**, **ѡбѣатиє**. Sokolov, 1.38, 1.94.

[58] Some *Shi'ur Qomah* descriptions also stress the idea of the immesurability of the Divine Face: "…The image of His face and the image of His cheeks is as the dimensions of the spirit and as the creation of the soul, such that no one can recognize it, as it is stated (in Scripture): 'His body is *tarshish*.' His splendor is luminous and glows from within the darkness, and (from within) the cloud and fog that surround Him and although they surround Him, all the princes of the Presence (supplicate) before Him as (obediently as water flows when it is poured from) a water-pitcher, because of the vision of His comeliness and beauty. There is no measurement (**מדה**) in our hands; the names (alone) are revealed." Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 47.

[59] Slav. **ѡбѣатиє (ѡбѣтїа)** literally can be translated as "embrace." This noun is related to the Slavonic verb—to embrace somebody, to fold somebody in one's hands. Francis Andersen translates the term as "scope" (the longer recension) and "extent" (the shorter recension).

[60] *2 Enoch* 39:6 "…I have seen the stature of the Lord, without measure and without analogy…."

[61] Markus Jastrow translates the term as "proportion," "standart," "definite quantity," "size," or "limit." M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; New York: Shalom, 1967), 2.1565.

[62] The stress on the immesurability of God in *2 Enoch* does not contradict the theology of the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition. Peter Schäfer observes that "the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition does not intend to state that God can be 'calculated,' that he is, so to speak,

various earthly and celestial phenomena.[63] It demonstrates a remarkable parallel to the later role of Metatron as the one who conveys to visionaries the measure/the stature of the Body. In the *Shi'ur Qomah* section of the *Merkavah Rabbah*, the following tradition is attested: "I said to him, to the Prince of Torah,[64] teach me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of the body (שיעור קומה)." (*Synopse* §688).[65] In later Jewish mysticism Enoch-Metatron himself is described as the measure[66] of the divine body.

In the conclusion of this section, it should be stressed that our analysis of the description of the Lord's corporeality in chapter 39 indicates that several features of this account manifest remarkable similarities to the concepts and imagery of the divine body found in the later Hekhalot and Merkabah writings. The development detectable in the Slavonic apocalypse, however, seems to represent a very early form of this tradition, which contains a vague sketch of what will take its definitive form in Jewish mysticism much later.

Bodily Ascent

It has been previously mentioned that Enoch's image in *2 Enoch* appears to be quite different from his portrait in the early Enochic circle. Among the new features that constitute this new enhanced profile of the seventh antedeluvian patriarch, a significant one can be found that seems related to our ongoing discussion about the cosmic body

---

a superman of enormous yet exactly measurable and conceivable dimensions … the completely absurd calculations is to demonstrate that God cannot be conceived of in human categories: he, 'as it were,' is like a human being and yet hidden." P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God. Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (tr. A. Pomerance; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 149–150.

[63] See, for example, *2 Enoch* 40:2–12: "I know everything, and everything I have written down in books, the heavens and their boundaries and their contents. And all the armies and their movements I have measured. And I have recorded the stars and the multitude of multitudes innumerable…. The solar circle I have measured, and its rays I have measured…. The lunar circle I have measured, and its movements… I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist…" Andersen, "2 Enoch," 164–166.

[64] = Metatron.

[65] Schäfer *et al*, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 252.

[66] G.G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288.

traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. This important feature appears in the first chapter of *2 Enoch*, which describes the beginning of Enoch's celestial ascent.

In *2 Enoch* 1:3 the reader finds the patriarch sleeping on his bed. According to the text Enoch sees a strange dream in which two huge angelic beings, with faces like the shining sun, approach the patriarch's bed and call him by his name. The text says that after the patriarch was awakened by the angels, he went out from his house closing the door behind him as the angels had ordered. Philip Alexander draws the reader's attention to an important detail in this description; he observes that *2 Enoch* "attests with a boldness and clarity nowhere matched in *1 Enoch* that Enoch ascended bodily to heaven…"[67] He also notes that this emphasis on the bodily ascent in the awakened condition represents a departure from the early Enochic materials attested in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, where the patriarch's ascension to heaven seems to be depicted as in a dream during sleep.[68] Alexander further observes that this unequivocal claim that a human could bodily enter the upper realm was profoundly problematic within the worldview of early Judaism.[69]

It is intriguing that the later Merkabah Enochic accounts, as with *2 Enoch*'s account, insist on the bodily ascension of the patriarch. Alexander observes that, *3 Enoch* "clearly envisages bodily ascent and so postulates the physical metamorphosis of Enoch" during which Enoch "becomes, like other angels, physically composed of fire."[70] Alexander also points to another consequence of this metamorphosis, namely, the enlargement of Metatron's body until it equaled the dimensions of the world.[71]

This connection between the bodily ascent of the visionary and the transformation of his body in *2 Enoch* and the *Sefer Hekhalot* is not coincidental, since in the Slavonic apocalypse, for the first time in the Enochic tradition as we saw earlier, the body of the patriarch becomes

---

[67] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to Second God," 104.

[68] Ibid., 103.

[69] Ibid., 102. It should be noted that despite the fact that *1 Enoch's* materials do not attest to the bodily ascent of the visionary, the transition to this concept occurred in early Judaism not later than the first century CE. Besides *2 Enoch's* evidence, which can be dated to the first century CE, before the destruction of the Second Temple, the Pauline passage attested in 2Cor 12 also demonstrates familiarity with the concept of the bodily ascent. I am indebted to Alan Segal for this clarification.

[70] Ibid., 106.

[71] Ibid., 106.

a locus of intense theological deliberation. As has been already demonstrated in the *Shi'ur Qomah* passage from *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch's body was explicitly compared with the divine body and linked with it by identical technical terminology. The insistence on the bodily ascent of the patriarch in *2 Enoch* seems also to constitute an important step in the forming of this new perspective on Enoch's physique, the development that reached its formative stage in the later Merkabah speculations about Metatron's body matching the size of the world.

Adam and Enoch: "Two Powers" in Heaven

Previous studies proposed that the traditions about the cosmic body of Metatron in later Jewish mysticism might have originated as a result of the polemics with the traditions about the cosmic body of the protoplast. Thus, Philip Alexander, in his comment on the motif of Enoch-Metatron enlargement in *3 Enoch* 9, refers to certain rabbinic traditions[72] about "the primordial Adam's body, like that of the Gnostic protoanthropos, [which] corresponded to the world in size, but was diminished to the present limited dimensions of the human body as a result of the fall."[73] He further suggests that *3 Enoch's* account about the gigantic body of Enoch-Metatron "maybe expressing in mythological language the idea that Enoch reversed the fall of Adam."[74]

Moshe Idel's research also reveals that "Jewish mystical literature indicates … a certain similarity between the enlarged states of Adam and Enoch."[75] He notes that "the end of the gigantic Adam is well-known: he was severely reduced in his human dimensions. Enoch, on the other hand, merited undergoing the reverse process" described in *3 Enoch* as the patriarch's elevation and elongation as the measure of the length and breadth of the world.[76]

Idel notes that in some rabbinic materials the conception of the elevated Enoch, depicted as the supreme angel Metatron, contains remnants of the Adamic traditions.[77] In these materials Enoch is conceived as the one who regained the cosmic status and the extraordinary qual-

---

[72] In *Gen. R.* 8:1, *b.* Hag. 12a, and possibly, in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1:1.
[73] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 111–112.
[74] Ibid., 112.
[75] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 225.
[76] Ibid., 225.
[77] Ibid., 220.

ities that the primordial Adam had lost after his transgression in the Garden of Eden, namely, his luminosity and size.[78]

Moreover, in some rabbinic accounts Metatron is often directly described as a counterpart of Adam predestined to substitute for the fallen patriarch even before his actual transgression.[79] Idel points[80] to the development of this theme in *3 Enoch*. The *Sefer Hekhalot* 48C reads:

> The Holy One, blessed be he, said: I made him strong, I took him, I appointed him, namely Metatron my servant, who is unique among all denizens of the heights. "I made him strong" in the generation of the first man… "I took him"—Enoch the son of Jared, from their midst, and brought him up… "I appointed him"—over all the storehouses and treasures which I have in every heaven… .[81]

According to this passage God elected Metatron already in the generation of the first man. Metatron was thus viewed as a preexistent divine being,[82] first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe.[83] Our research will later demonstrate that in

---

[78] Cf. *b.* Sanh. 38b: "Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The first man reached from one end of the world to the other… R. Elezar said: The first man reached from earth to heaven… but when he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid His hand upon him and diminished him…." *The Babylonian Talmud (Hebrew-English Edition) Sanhedrin* (trs. J. Shachter and H. Freedman; London: Soncino, 1994), 38b.

[79] Isaiah Tishby observes that in both the *Raya Mehemna* and the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar*, Metatron is portrayed as the lord of the lower chariot, a human figure seated upon the throne; and in this role he is called "the lesser Adam." Tishby notes that according to the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar* "…Metatron was created first and foremost among all the hosts of heaven below, and he is the lesser Adam, which the Holy One, blessed be He, made in the celestial image." I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994), 2.628–629. In some Zoharic materials Metatron's name(s), similar to Adam's name, are also juxtaposed with the tradition about the four corners of the world: "This is Metatron, which is higher [than the creatures] by a distance of five hundred years. Metatron, Mitatron, Zevul, Eved, Zevoel—here are five [names], and *his names multiply in four directions to the four corners of the world* according to the missions of his Master." Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2.643.

[80] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 226.

[81] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 311.

[82] Scholem argued that in the Metatron lore one can find two possible concepts of this angel. The first one considers him as an angelic counterpart of the seventh antediluvian patriarch translated to heaven before the Flood and transfigured into an immortal angelic being. He argued that there was also another trend in which Metatron was not connected with Enoch or any other human prototype but was understood as a pre-existent angel. See G. Scholem, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset Press, 1987), 378–380.

[83] It is noteworthy that the motif of Enoch as the redeemer and the restorer of prelapsarian humanity can be traced to *2 Enoch* 64:4–5 where the patriarch is portrayed as the one who carried away the sin of humankind. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 190.

2 Enoch the account of Enoch's elevation, similarly to this Metatron tradition, is juxtaposed with the story of the elevated prelapsarian Adam. Idel also observes that in Jewish mystical literature another significant parallelism in the depictions of the corporalities of Adam and Enoch can be detected. He points out that in both cases "their immense size caused an error of faith, namely other creatures were induced to believe that two powers governed the universe, not God alone."[84]

Several rabbinic and Hekhalot sources, including *b*. Hag. 15a, *Sefer Hekhalot* 16, and *Merkavah Rabbah* (*Synopse* §672) attest to a tradition according to which the terrifying vision of Metatron, seated on a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, caused Aher to believe that Metatron represents the second power in heaven.

In *3 Enoch* 16:1–5 Enoch-Metatron tells to Rabbi Ishmael the following story:

> At first I sat upon a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, and I judged all the denizens of the heights on the authority of the Holy One, blessed be he… I sat in the heavenly court. The princes of kingdoms stood beside me, to my right and to my left, by authority of the Holy One, blessed be he. But when Aher came to behold the vision of the chariot and set eyes upon me, he was afraid and trembled before me. His soul was alarmed to the point of leaving him, because of his fear, dread, and terror of me, when he saw me seated[85] upon a throne like king, with ministering angels standing beside me as servants and all the princes of kingdoms crowned with crowns surrounding me.[86]

Despite the prominent role that Enoch-Metatron plays in the "two powers" controversy, the initial background of this tradition about the erroneous veneration of the exalted humanity appears to originate, not in the Enochic, but in the Adamic tradition.[87]

Jarl Fossum's research demonstrates that the motif of the misplaced adoration of Adam by the angels appears in several forms in the

---

[84] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 225.

[85] The rabbinic tradition states that there is no sitting in heaven, where according to *b*. Hag. 15a, the privilege of "seating" beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe"; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel. It is important that the motif of the "seating" of Enoch-Metatron in heaven is first documented in *2 Enoch* 23:4 where the archangel Vereveil allows the patriarch to sit down and "write everything."

[86] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 268.

[87] For Adam's connection with the two powers' traditions, see Segal's pioneering research: A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 108–115.

rabbinic literature.[88] Thus, from *Gen. R.* 8:10 one can learn that when God created man in his own image "the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim 'Holy' before Him… What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [only a mortal] man."[89] In the *Alphabet of R. Akiba* the angels' erroneous behavior is explained through the reference to Adam's gigantic body:[90]

> This teaches that initially Adam was created from the earth to the firmament. When the ministering angels saw him, they were shocked and excited by him. At that time they all stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him; "Master of the Universe! There are two powers in the world, one in heaven and one on earth." What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do then? He placed His hand on him, and decreased him,[91] setting him at one thousand cubits.[92]

---

[88] Jarl Fossum differentiates three major forms of this tradition: "(1) The angels mistake Adam for God and want to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God lets sleep fall upon Adam so it becomes clear that the latter is human; (2) all creatures mistake Adam for their creator and wish to bow before him, but Adam teaches them to render all honor to God as their true creator; (3) the angels mistake Adam for God and wish to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God reduces Adam's size." J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," in: *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1996), 1.529–530. An important similarity can be detected between these Adamic traditions and the Metatron accounts. In *b.* Hag. 15a God punished Metatron with sixty fiery lashes. Alan Segal observes that "just as Metatron needed correction for the false impression he gave Aher, so Adam needs correction for the false impression given the angels." Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 112. Indeed, in the Adamic accounts of two powers the protoplast is disciplined in various ways, including the reduction of his stature.

[89] *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.61.

[90] It should be noted that the traditions about the gigantic body of Adam were widespread in the rabbinic literature. See: A. Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, "La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles apres J.-C.," *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–185; J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1996), 1.529–539; S. Niditch, "The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature," *JJS* 34 (1983) 137–146; Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975); Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, 108–115.

[91] *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1:1 reflects the same tradition: "Said R. Aibu, 'At that moment the first man's stature was cut down and diminished to one hundred cubits.'" *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana* (tr. J. Neusner; 2 vols.; BJS, 122–123; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 1.1.

[92] Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 226.

It is clear that these Adamic accounts do not originate in the rabbinic literature under the influence of Metatron's story but in early pseudepigraphical writings. Scholars observe[93] that these accounts have their roots in the prominent story already found in the primary Adam books[94] and other early materials,[95] according to which God himself ordered the angels to venerate Adam, and all the angels except Satan bowed before the first human.

The prototype of the story of the misplaced veneration of Enoch-Metatron also can be traced to this early Adamic lore. It is possible that the transition from the Adamic two powers template to the Enoch-Metatron two powers template occurred not in the rabbinic period but much earlier, that is, already inside the Second Temple Judaism. M. Stone has demonstrated that in *2 Enoch* 22 the Adamic tradition of the protoplast's veneration by the angels was skillfully transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[96] It is not coincidental that the transference of the "two powers" tradition from Adam to Enoch was made for the first time in the Slavonic Apocalypse where the protoplast and the seventh antediluvian patriarch were interconnected via the conception of the cosmic body.

---

[93] Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," 382; Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," 530–531.

[94] The account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels is also found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13–15. These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. The first man was then brought before God's face by the archangel Michael to bow down to God. God commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast, except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was "younger" than ("posterior" to) Satan.

[95] The Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4, Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24, and *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85.

[96] M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21–22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. He observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21–22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Stones notes that, besides the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase "sounding them out," found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as "making a trial of them." Stone notes that the expressions "sounding them out" or "making a trial of them" imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested. Cf. M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.

Two Bodies Created According to the Likeness of the Third One

Our previous analysis has shown that in the various Jewish texts the traditions about Adam's and Enoch's corporalities often appear to be linked and share similar imagery. Our investigation has also demonstrated that this connection can be detected already in *2 Enoch*. A critical question, however, still remains: how can these traditions about the corporealities of the two patriarchs be related to the *Shi'ur Qomah* account of the Divine Face found in chapter 39.

It appears that the depiction of the divine anthropomorphic extent, labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's Face, serves as an important locus that unifies the Adamic tradition of the cosmic body of the protoplast and the Enochic tradition about the glorious angelic body of the translated patriarch. Our research must now turn to the analysis of the accounts of the Divine Face which unifies both traditions.

It should be noted that *2 Enoch* contains two descriptions involving the motif of the Divine Face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22, a chapter which depicts Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. The second account appears in chapter 39 where the patriarch reports his initial theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to earth, adding some new details. Although both descriptions demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the Divine Face with the Lord's anthropomorphic "extent." It is also significant that in both theophanic descriptions the stature of the Lord, His "Face," is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the Divine Form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, indicating the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.[97] The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through this light, which serves as a luminous screen, "the face" of this anthropomorphic extent. *2 Enoch's* theophanies, which use the metaphors of light and fire, may well be connected with such tra-

[97] April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. Cf. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, 104–105.

ditions where the Divine "Form" is hidden behind the incandescent "face," which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.[98]

In *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 the "face" is closely associated with the divine "extent" and seems to be understood, not simply as a part of the Lord's body, but as a radiant *façade* of His whole anthropomorphic "stature." This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's form is reinforced by an additional parallel in which Enoch's face is identified with Enoch's form. The association between the Divine Face and the Divine Form in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 closely resembles the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18–23, where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with the glorious Divine form, God's *Kavod*.

The motif of the Divine Face has paramount significance for our investigation since it serves as a symbol decisively linking Enoch's newly acquired luminous angelic body with the glorious body of the protoplast. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes place in the front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's "Face." From *2 Enoch* 22 one can learn that the vision of the divine "Face" had drastic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[99] This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as "one of the glorious ones." During this transition in the front of the Lord's face Enoch's own "face" has been radically altered and the patriarch has now acquired a new glorious "visage" which reflects the luminosity[100] of the Lord's *Pa-*

---

[98] The imagery of the divine Face plays an important role in Merkabah mysticism. In the *Hekhalot Rabbati* the following descriptions can be found: "… the holy living creatures … put on garments of fire and wrap themselves in a covering of flame, and cover their faces with a lighting bolt, and the Holy One, blessed be He, unveils His face." *Synopse*, §184. "The honored King is enthroned and He rises up the living creatures… They embrace Him and they kiss Him and they unveil their faces. They unveil themselves and the King of Glory covers His face, and the Arabot firmament used to burst like a sieve before the face of the King." *Synopse*, §189.

[99] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[100] *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frozen," then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous

nim.[101] The account of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 39 also stresses the proximity between the Face and the patriarch's body. It is expressed through a series of analogical comparisons that demonstrates that Enoch's new transformed stature is fashioned in the *likeness* of the Lord's "Face."

This creation in the likeness of the Lord's Face represents an important link that connects this new angelic body of Enoch with the body of the glorious Adam. It has been demonstrated that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch was "created." The new creation fashioned after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who according to the Slavonic apocalypse was also "modeled" during his creation after the Face of God. In *2 Enoch* 44:1 one can learn that the protoplast was created in the likeness of God's Face. The text says that "the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of *his own face*, both small and great, the Lord created [them]."[102] It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical reading attested in Gen 1:26–27, where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). In view of this departure, the author of the recent English translation of the Slavonic apocalypse, Francis Andersen, observes that *2 Enoch*'s "idea is remarkable from any point of view … This is not the original meaning of *tselem*… The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for 'image.'"[103]

---

entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another "Enochic" text, the *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 "R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 267.

[101] It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's "face" itself, similar to the Lord's face, acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus, in *2 Enoch* 64:3–5 the following tradition can be found: "…and the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch… O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 190.

[102] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 170.

[103] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 171, note b.

The previous analysis, however, demonstrates that this reading does not arise in the Slavonic environment but belongs to the original argument of *2 Enoch*, where the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic "creation" of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

This connection also reveals that the bodies of the two characters of the Slavonic apocalypse, the prelapsarian corporeality of the protoplast and the body of his luminous counterpart, the patriarch Enoch, are both fashioned in the likeness of the third body, namely, the extent of the Lord, also known as the luminous "Face." It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* the interconnection of all three corporealities, the glorious body of the protoplast, the glorious body of the elevated Enoch, and the luminous divine body, is made via the account of the Divine Face where, according to Gershom Scholem, the precise *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology might have already been made evident.

SECRETS OF CREATION IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

> Enoch was found blameless, and he walked with the Lord and he was taken away, a sign of דעת for generations.
>
> (Cairo Geniza Ms. B Sirach 44:16)
>
> … the learned savant who guards the secrets of the great gods.
>
> (Tablet from Nineveh, 19)

I. *The Secrets*

The notion of "secrets" occupies a distinct place in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*. The importance of this terminology is highlighted by its prominent position in the title of the book. While various manuscripts of *2 Enoch* are known under different titles, most of them[1] include the word "secrets."[2] In some of these titles the term is connected with Enoch's books—"The Secret Books of Enoch."[3] In other titles "secrets" are linked either to God ("The Book[s] [called] the Secrets of God, a

---

[1] Several MSS do not include the word "secrets" in their titles. Among them—*J* ("The word of Enoch…"), *B* ("The life of righteous Enoch…"), *MPr* ("From the book of righteous Enoch"), *P*[2] ("The book of Enoch the son of Ared"). Cf. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 2.47; 2.83; 2.106 and 1.145.

[2] **тайны**. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952) 2. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Vaillant's edition.

[3] Cf. MSS *A*: "From the secret book(s) about the taking away of Enoch the just," *Tr.*: "Which are called the secret books of Enoch," *U*: "From the secret books about the taking away of Enoch the just," and *Rum.*: "From the secret books of Enoch." Cf. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.103; Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.161; 1.111; and 1.153.

revelation to Enoch")[4] or to Enoch himself ("The Book of the Secrets of Enoch").[5] This consistency in the use of the term "secrets," in spite of its varied attribution to different subjects, may indicate that the authors and/or the transmitters of the text viewed the motif of "secrets" as a central theme of the apocalypse. The purpose of this chapter is to call attention to some details of this theme in *2 Enoch*.

The Story

Despite the prominent role the word "secrets" seems to play in the titles of the book, it occurs, quite unexpectedly, only three times in the main body of *2 Enoch*, twice in chapter 24 and once in chapter 36. It is not, however, coincidental that the term is found in this section of the book. Chapters 24–36 of *2 Enoch* can be viewed as the climax of angelic and divine revelations to Enoch during his celestial tour. From these chapters we learn that Enoch, previously described to have been "placed" into the clothes of glory and instructed by the archangel Vereveil, was called by the Lord. The book tells that the Lord decided to reveal to Enoch the secrets of his creation, which he never explained even to his angels. Further the term "secrets" is applied only to this account of God's creation, conveyed to Enoch by the Lord himself, "face to face."[6] The content of these revelations includes the following details:

1. Prior to the Creation the Lord decided to establish the foundation of all created things;
2. He commanded one of the invisible "things" to come out of the very lowest darkness and become visible;
3. By Lord's command a primordial "great aeon," bearing the name Adoil, descended and, disintegrating himself, revealed all creation which the Lord "had thought up to create";[7]
4. The Lord created a throne for himself. He then ordered the light to become the foundation for the highest things;

---

[4] MSS *V*, *N* "And these are the books (called) the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch." Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.83. Cf. also B^2 "This is the book of the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch." Sokolov, 1.133.

[5] Cf. *P* "The book about the secrets of Enoch, the son of Ared," and *R* "The books of the holy secrets of Enoch…" Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952), 2 and Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.1.

[6] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.140.

[7] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144.

5. The Lord called out the second aeon, bearing the name Arukhas, who became the foundation of the lowest things;
6. From the waters the Lord "hardened big stones," establishing the solid structure above the waters;
7. The Lord fashioned the heavens and the sun;
8. From fire the Lord created the armies of "the bodiless ones";
9. The Lord created vegetation, fish, reptiles birds and animals;
10. The Lord created man.

While the general structure of the account of creation appears to be similar in the shorter and the longer recension, the latter offers a lengthy account dedicated to Adam's creation and his transgression.

Let it be also noted that the notion of "secrets" sets symbolic boundaries for the story of creation; it begins and closes the account of creation. In chapter 24 the Lord tells Enoch that he wants to instruct him in His secrets. In some manuscripts of the longer recension, chapter 24 even has a specific heading, "About the great secrets of God, which God revealed and related to Enoch; and he spoke with him face to face."[8] In chapter 36, which serves as a conclusion of the Lord's instruction, the Lord promises Enoch the role of the expert in His secrets—"Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever. And you will be seeing *my secrets* (**таинъı моꙗ**) …"[9]

Expert in Secrets

The tradition about Enoch as an expert in God's secrets does not begin in *2 Enoch*. Already in the earliest Enochic books of *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, the knowledge and the revelation of secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch.[10] Later Enochic traditions also emphasize the role of Enoch as the "Knower of Secrets" (**יודע רזים**). According to *3 Enoch*, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold "deep secrets and wonderful mysteries."[11] In this Merkabah text Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as

[8] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.140.

[9] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.161.

[10] The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is attested as the one who "saw all secrets of heaven…." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2.128.

[11] *3 Enoch* 11:2. Here and later I have used Philip Alexander's English translation of *3 Enoch*, and follow his division in chapters. Cf. P. Alexander "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse

to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that "in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage, the ultimate revealer of divine secrets."[12]

Two recent important studies[13] in Enochic traditions trace the origin of the image of Enoch as a primeval sage preoccupied with divine secrets to some heroes of the Mesopotamian lore. According to these studies, one of these possible prototypes can be an intriguing character of the "Sumerian" Kings list—Enmeduranki, king of Sippar. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. In other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations remarkably similar to Enoch's story. Among these roles are that of the knower and the guardian of the secrets of gods.[14]

The tablet from Nineveh, possibly dated before 1100 BCE, is a primary witness to the parallels between the stories of Enoch and Enmeduranki.[15] The text, reconstructed by W.G. Lambert,[16] describes Enmeduranki's initiation into the divine secrets and attests him as "the learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods." In this text[17]

---

of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.264.

[12] H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 27.

[13] J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988). On Mesopotamian origins of Enoch's figure, see also: H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung," in E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Berlin: Reuther& Reichard, 1902–1903), 2.530–543; H.L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210.

[14] P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 182 and 186. Enmeduranki was also regarded as the founder of the *bārû* guild, the elite group of diviners, the experts in omens. Cf. J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 42.

[15] Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 190.

[16] W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967) 126–138.

[17] The text reads as follows:

3. "Šamaš in Ebabbara [appointed]
1. Enmeduranki [king of Sippar],
2. the beloved of Anu, Enlil [and Ea].

Enmeduranki also functions as a mediator between the deities and the people of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon. He instructs them in the secrets, which he received from the deities.

Kvanvig observes that the tablet emphasizes the esoteric character of the divine wisdom revealed to Enmeduranki, reinforced by such terms as *niṣirtu* (mystery) and *pirištu* (secret).[18]

Another important detail in the passage is the juxtaposition of the terms "secrets" and "mysteries" with the phrases "heaven and underworld" and "heaven and earth." Kvanvig points out that both phrases have a "cosmological" meaning.[19] Intended to describe the totality of creation—"the whole world," this terminology can also be related to cosmogonic and creational concepts.

---

4. Šamaš and Adad [brought him in] to their assembly,
5. Šamaš and Adad [honored him],
6. Šamaš and Adad [set him] on a large throne of gold,
7. They showed him how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, [Enlil and Ea],
8. They gave him the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and [underworld],
9. They put in his hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.
10. Then he, in accordance with their [word(?)] brought
11. the men of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon into his presence,
12. and he honoured them. He set them on thrones before [him],
13. he showed them how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, Enlil and Ea,
14. He gave them the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and underworld,
15. He put in their hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.
16. {The tablet of the gods, the liver, a mystery of heaven and underworld;
17. how to observe oil on water, a secret of Anu, Enlil and Ea;
18. 'that with commentary,' When Anu, Enlil; and how to make mathematical calculations.}
19. The learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods,
20. will bind his son whom he loves with an oath
21. before Šamaš and Adad by tablet and stylus and
22. will instruct him. When a diviner,
23. an expert in oil, of abiding descent, offspring of Enmeduranki, king of Sippar,
24. who set up the pure bowl and held the cedar[-rod],
25. a benediction priest of the king, a long-haired priest of Šamaš
26. as fashioned by Ninhursagga,
27. begotten by a *nišakku*-priest of pure descent:
28. if he is without blemish in body and limbs
29. he may approach the presence of Šamaš and Adad where liver inspection and oracle (take place)."

W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," 132.

[18] Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 188.

[19] Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 188.

Secrets in Enochic traditions

Just as the role of Enoch as the Knower of secrets does not begin in *2 Enoch*, so also the information about the heavenly secrets is not peculiar only to this apocalypse. We encounter this theme in other biblical and the pseudepigraphical texts,[20] including the early Enochic booklets of *1 Ethiopic Enoch*.

1 Enoch applies the term "secrets" to various things Enoch acquires during his celestial tour. In 41:1–3 Enoch tells about his experience:

> … I saw all the secrets of heaven, and how the kingdom is divided, and how the deeds of men are weighed in the balance. There I saw the dwelling of the chosen and the resting-places of the holy; and my eyes saw there all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven from there, and they dragged them off, and they were not able to remain because of the punishment which went out from the Lord of Spirits. And there my eyes saw the secrets of the flashes of lightning and the thunder, and the secrets of the winds, how they are distributed in order to blow over the earth, and the secrets of the clouds and of the dew…[21]

The passage shows that in *1 Enoch* the secrets include not only astronomical, cosmological, and calendarical information, but also eschatological details which Enoch acquired either himself or through angelic mediators.[22] The unity between the cosmological and the eschatological, between the secrets of "heaven" and the secrets of "earth," is prominent in *1 Enoch* 52:2, where Enoch attests that he "saw the secrets

---

[20] On the notion of "secrets" in the Old Testament and the Pseudepigrapha see Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT, 2/136; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1990). Qumran texts also use extensively the notions of "secret" (רז) and "special knowledge" (דעת) and apply them to varied things, including the Torah and the halachic preceipts. Cf. Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, 53–56; W.D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 1.1:25–30," in W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 119–144; B. Reicke, "Daᶜat and Gnosis in Intertestamental Literature," *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox; Edinburg: Clark, 1969), 245–255; H. Ringgren, "Qumran and Gnosticism," *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo* (ed. U. Bianchi; SHR, 12; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 379–388.

[21] Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.128–129.

[22] For a complete discussion about "revealed things" in apocalyptic literature see M. Stone's pioneering research in M. Stone "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (eds. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, and P.D. Miller, Jr.; New York: Doubleday, 1967), 414–452.

of heaven, everything that will occur on earth: a mountain of iron, and a mountain of copper, and a mountain of silver, and a mountain of gold, and a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead … all these things which serve the authority of the Messiah."[23] Markus Bockmuehl notes that cosmological and eschatological secrets occur repeatedly in tandem and show the intimate link between the cosmological mysteries of heaven and the eschatological questions pursued by the visionaries.[24]

The tendency to include the knowledge about future eschatological events in the notion of "secrets" can be found both in the Pseudepigrapha and in the Bible. Bockmuehl observes that the term רז in Daniel always relates in some way to a disclosure of the future.[25] The labeling of disclosures of the future as "secrets" becomes a prominent motif in the later "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhalot.* In *3 Enoch* 11:2–3 Enoch-Metatron tells R. Ishmael that from the time of his elevation he has acquired an ability to see deep secrets and wonderful mysteries.[26] According to the text, before a man thinks in secret, Metatron is able see his thought; before a man acts, he can see his act. Metatron concludes that "there is nothing in heaven above or deep within the earth concealed from me."[27] It is clear that the passage understands "secrets" to be foresights of human deeds and thoughts.

3 Enoch also demonstrates some other affinities with *1 Enoch* in its usage of the notion "secrets." First, it applies the word "secrets" to various revealed "things"—"all mysteries of wisdom, all the depths of the perfect Torah, and the thoughts of human hearts."[28] Second, in similarity with *1 Enoch*, it includes eschatological and historical details under the category of the "secrets." Third, the angels in *3 Enoch* are aware of God's secrets: "YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me…"[29] Fourth, Gruenwald's research emphasizes the close proximity between apocalyptic and Merkabah mysticism

---

[23] Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.136.

[24] Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, 35.

[25] Ibid., 36.

[26] להסתכל ברזי עמוקה ובסוד מופלאה. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 9.

[27] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.264.

[28] *3 Enoch* 11:1. Cf. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.264.

[29] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.315.

in the concept of "secret oath/name" which plays a significant role in the cosmology of *1 Enoch* and *3 Enoch*.[30]

In contrast to these apocalyptic and Merkabah Enochic texts, *2 Enoch* offers a different understanding of "secrets." At least four points of difference need to be noted. First, *2 Enoch* does not apply the notion of "secrets" to many types of revelation. This term occurs very rarely in the book and is reserved only for the particular cosmogonic[31] revelation of the Lord. Second, the term is never applied to an earthly affair, not even in reference to historical and eschatological information. Third, the "secret name" does not play any significant role in *2 Enoch's* cosmogony. Fourth, the angels in *2 Enoch* do not know about God's cosmogonic "secrets."

Moreover, it seems that in *2 Enoch* the realm of the secrets, even "topologically," transcends the angelic world. The shorter recension tells us that before the cosmogonic revelation took place, the Lord had "placed" Enoch to the left of Himself, closer than Gabriel.[32] Further, the Lord confirms the transcendence of the knowledge about creation over the angelic world when He informs Enoch that even to his angels He has explained neither his secrets nor his "endless and inconceivable creation which He conceived."[33]

The "secrecy" of the Lord's revelation is underscored further by several additional factors.

First, immediately following the cosmogonic instructions, the Lord informed Enoch that he appointed an intercessor, the archangel Michael, and guardian angels, Arioch and Marioch,[34] for Enoch's writings which should not perish in the impending flood:

---

[30] I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 10–11.

[31] On cosmogony in *2 Enoch*, see S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and J. Jouco Bleeker (eds.), *Types of Redemption* (SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969), 109–116; G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1991), 98–101; *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

[32] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.143.

[33] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.143.

[34] On the origin of the names Arioch and Marioch see J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985), 321–328; L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 199–200.

> For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers—Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33:10–12).[35]

The motif of the guardian angels of the books is peculiar to the esoteric tradition conveyed to Enoch. It might indicate that we are dealing here with the famous "secret" books by which antediluvian wisdom reached postdeluvian generations. This motif of antediluvian "secret" writings has a number of parallels in Mesopotamian lore.[36]

Second, the esoteric details of the Lord's cosmogonic revelations do not appear in chapters 39–66, dedicated to Enoch's instructions to his children. In these chapters Enoch shares the information about his heavenly tour and his extraordinary experiences near the Throne of Glory. He conveys to his children an esoteric knowledge which includes meteorological, cosmological, and eschatological information. In this section of the book Enoch even offers a lengthy description of the Lord's limbs "without measure and analogy"[37] which, some scholars believe, belongs to another highly esoteric trend of Jewish mysticism.[38] The full account of God's cosmogonic revelations, however, does not appear in these instructions of Enoch. Even though the text makes several allusions to the creation story, telling us that "the Lord was the one who laid the foundations upon the unknown things and … spread out the heavens above the visible and the invisible things,"[39] Enoch never discloses to his children the full story about Adoil and Arukhas.

---

[35] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.157.

[36] Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 9–13.

[37] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.163.

[38] G. Scholem argues that the terminology of this section in *2 Enoch* shows apparent similarities to the שיעור קומה tradition. Cf. G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1991), 29.

[39] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.174.

II. *Secrets of Creation in the Merkabah Tradition*

Despite the differences in the treatment of "secrets" in *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* that have been mentioned earlier, the approach to the mysteries of creation found in *3 Enoch* demonstrates close affinities with that in the *Slavonic Enoch*.

The theme of the secrets of creation plays an important role in *3 Enoch*; it is surrounded by several details found in *2 Enoch*. The similarities include the following points:

1. One of these parallels is Enoch's initiation into the secrets of Creation. The important detail in both texts is that some preparatory instructions before the account of creation were given through angels. In the case of *3 Enoch*, the instructions were given through the angels known as the "Prince of Wisdom" (שר החכמה) and the "Prince of Understanding" (שר הבינה); in the case of *2 Enoch* they came through the angel Vereveil (Вερεвεил). In both books these angelic mediators do not reveal "secrets" but offer instead some preparatory knowledge. In *2 Enoch* Vereveil instructs Enoch in different "things"—"all things of heaven and earth and sea and all the elements and the movements and their courses … and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn" (23:1–2).[40] In *3 Enoch* the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding teach Enoch-Metatron "wisdom"—"the wisdom of those above and those below, the wisdom of this world and the world to come."[41]

2. Both texts also mention that immediately after these preparatory angelic instructions, the Lord (the Holy One) reveals "the secrets of creation" to Enoch (Metatron). From *3 Enoch* 11:2 we learn that all the secrets of creation (סתרי בראשית)[42] now stand revealed before Enoch-Metatron as they stand revealed before the Creator. In *2 Enoch* 24:2–4 the Lord instructs Enoch in the secrets of his "endless and incon-

[40] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.140.

[41] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.264.

[42] MS M40. Cf. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 8. MS V228 instead of "the secrets of creation" uses—"the orders of creation" (סדרי בראשית). Cf. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 9.

ceivable creation," the mysteries which he never explained even to his angels:

> Whatever you see, Enoch, things standing still and moving about and which were brought to perfection by me, I myself will explain it to you … And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their composition, nor my endless and inconceivable creation which I conceived, as I am making them known to you today.[43]

3. As was mentioned earlier, the notion of "secrets" in *3 Enoch* includes various types of revelations. Even though the book applies the term "secrets" to several things, including the Torah, it also seems to use the notion of "the special secret" in reference to certain details of the Account of Creation. According to the book, this special secret plays an important role in "God's creation of everything." We learn about the secret from *3 Enoch* 48D, where Metatron tells R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed the special secret Moses, in spite of the protests of the heavenly hosts:

> YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me. They said to me, "Why are you revealing this secret to humankind, born of woman, blemished, unclean, defiled by blood and impure flux, men who excrete putrid drops—that secret by which heaven and earth were created, the sea and the dry land, mountains and hills, rivers and springs, Gehinnom, fire and hail, the garden of Eden and the tree of life? By it Adam was formed, the cattle and the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven and the fish of the sea, Behemoth and Leviathan, the unclean creatures and reptiles, the creeping things of the sea and the reptiles of the deserts, Torah, wisdom, knowledge, thought, the understanding of things above, and the fear of heaven. Why are you revealing it to flesh and blood?"[44]

P. Alexander observes that in this passage "the secret" could be either (1) the Torah, or (2) the secret names of God. He further suggests that "the identification of the secret with the Torah appears to be excluded by the fact that Torah is one of the things created by the secret."[45] This situation in which the notion of "secret" transcends the realm of the Torah and refers instead to God's creation appears to have close affinities to the position of *2 Enoch*, where the Torah is not listed among God's mysteries.

---

[43] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.143.
[44] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.315.
[45] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.315.

III. *Secrets of Creation in the Zoharic Tradition*

The cosmogonic account in *2 Enoch* demonstrates close similarities not only with that in the Merkabah tradition[46] but also with much later developments of Jewish mysticism. The following analysis is an attempt to trace some affinities between the account of creation in *2 Enoch* and that in some medieval texts of Jewish mysticism.

Stones

In one of his books[47] G. Scholem points to an interesting detail in the creation narrative in *2 Enoch*. The story involves the enigmatic stones the Lord placed in the waters during the process of creation. In chapters 28–29, when the Lord instructed Enoch about the secrets of the Account of Creation, He said:

> Then from the waters I hardened[48] big stones,[49] and the clouds of the depths[50] I commanded to dry themselves. And I did not name what fell to the lowest places.[51] Gathering the ocean into one place, I bound it with a yoke. I gave to the sea an eternal boundary, which will not be broken through by the waters. The solid structure[52] I fixed and established it above the waters (28:2–4).[53]

The theme of the "big stones" plays an important role in the creation narrative of *2 Enoch*. G. Scholem draws attention to the relationship between these enigmatic stones and the cosmogonic tradition of "an esoteric baraitha[54] in which the word בהו in תהו ובהו of Genesis 1:2 was

---

[46] On the Merkabah features of *2 Enoch* cf. A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; *idem*, "The Origin of the Name Metatron and the Text of *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch*," *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26.

[47] G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 73.

[48] The verb **оутвѣрдити** could be also rendered as "to place." Sreznevskij's dictionary lists this translation among possible meanings of the Slavonic word. See I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989), 3.1306.

[49] **камение велико**.

[50] **бездънымъ**. Another choice for translation can be "*abyss*." Kurz and Sreznevskij equate the Slavonic term with the Greek ἄβυσσος. Cf. J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského [Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae]* (4 vols.; Prague, 1958–1992), 1.76; Sreznevskij, *Slovar*', 1.55.

[51] **бездны**. Again the same term, which can be translated as "*abyss*."

[52] **Твердь**. This Slavonic word can be also translated as "a foundation." The verb **wснованх** ("established") favors such a translation.

[53] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.147.

[54] *b*. Hag. 12a.

interpreted as muddy stones, sunk in the abyss."[55] Scholem's remark[56] invites a further exploration into the role of the enigmatic stones in Aggadic traditions. *m.* Hag. 2:1 prohibits the exposition of מעשה בראשית in the public. Cosmogonic doctrines, however, were important during all stages of Jewish mysticism,[57] and occupied a prominent place in such books as *Sefer Yetsirah* and *Sefer ha-Bahir*.[58] Isaiah Tishby observes that the understanding of the causes and processes of the formation of the world became one of the central themes in late Jewish mysticism.[59]

In late Jewish mysticism, especially in the *Zohar*, the theme of the big stones placed by the Creator in the waters (in the abyss) occupied an important place. In spite of the late date of the *Zohar*, these materials have preserved important early traditions relevant to the subject of our research. Moreover, this medieval compendium of Jewish mystical knowledge mentions a book under the title "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch"[60] which is identical with the titles given to *2 Enoch* in some manuscripts.[61]

Similarities between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* are not confined only to the title of the *Slavonic Enoch*. Several scholars, including G.H. Box and H. Odeberg, have noted striking parallels between both texts, especially in the materials of the longer recension. G.H. Box points to the connection between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* and observes that "the *Slavonic Enoch* … is remarkably illuminating in its realistic presentment of some of the Kabbalistic ideas—e.g. as to the process of creation, the consti-

---

[55] Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 74. He points also to "the muddy stones from which darkness flows" in the Targum on Job 28:8. Another interesting early parallel could be "stones of bohu" in Isa 34:11.

[56] Gershom Scholem was a unique exception in his field, as he persistently tried to investigate the relationships between *2 Enoch* and the Jewish mystical traditions. Even though his observations on possible parallels between *2 Enoch* and Jewish texts are not systematic, they are very perceptive and can provide many insights for students of *2 Enoch*.

[57] Cf. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954).

[58] For the discussion of the parallels between the cosmogonies of these two texts and *2 Enoch* cf. G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 73–75; *idem*, *On Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York.: Schocken, 1991), 98–100.

[59] I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994), 2.549.

[60] ובספרא דרזין דחנוך. 2.180b. Cf. R. Margaliot, ed., ספר הזהר (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 2.360.

[61] Cf. *P* книга ѡ таинахъ єноховихъ ("The book about the secrets of Enoch") and *R* книги свѧтиχ таинь єноχов ("The books of the holy secrets of Enoch"). Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952), 1; Sokolov, 1.1.

tution of the heavens, and so on."[62] H. Odeberg, who was Box's student at the University of London, holds a similar view.[63] In spite of some apparent deficiencies in his edition[64] of *3 Enoch* his work contains important insights into possible relationships between the *Slavonic Enoch* and late Jewish mysticism. Odeberg, who used Forbes' separate translations of the shorter and longer recensions of *2 Enoch*, makes a number of provocative comments on the nature of the Jewish mystical traditions incorporated in these texts. In his opinion, the longer recension sometimes contains concepts that belong to a later (post-Hekhaloth) development of Jewish mysticism. In this respect, he found a number of striking similarities with the Zoharic tradition. It should be noted that Odeberg's position was partially conditioned by his favoring of the shorter recension as more ancient and original.[65] He viewed the longer recension as a later expansion of the shorter one. In the light of the recent studies of F. Andersen, J. Charlesworth,[66] A. de Santos Otero,[67] and C. Böttrich,[68] who argue for the originality of the longer recension, Odeberg's hypothesis is losing its persuasive power. In this context an investigation of the possible parallels between the story of creation in *2 Enoch* and the Account of Creation in the *Zohar* can contribute not only to our understanding of the hypothetical provenance of the longer recension but to the provenance of the text in general. It also can clarify the formative value of the account of creation in *2 Enoch* for subsequent

---

[62] W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920), 236.

[63] Cf. H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), 1.22.

[64] Cf. J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), xi–xlvii.

[65] Although, "original" might be an inappropriate word here. P. Sacchi rightly observes that "the original is an abstract concept; no one possesses the author's manuscript. Even the original of the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* is only the most ancient form of the text available, and therefore the closest to the Original (with a capital 'O')." Cf. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 237.

[66] Cf. J.H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323; *idem*, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 102–106.

[67] A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del AT* (ed. A. Díez Macho; 4 vols.; Madrid: Ediciones Christiandad, 1984) 4.147–202.

[68] C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992); *idem*, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ, 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); *idem*, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995).

rabbinic developments. The importance of such inquiry constitutes one of the reasons for the inclusion of some materials from the *Book of Zohar* in our research.

Zohar I, 231a reads:

> The world did not come into being until God took a certain stone, which is called the "foundation stone,"[69] and cast it into the abyss[70] so that it held fast there, and from it the world was planted. This is the central point of the universe, and on this point stands the holy of holies. This is the stone referred to in the verses, "Who laid the corner-stone thereof" (Job XXXVIII, 6), "the stone of testing, the precious corner-stone" (Is. XXVIII, 16), and "the stone that the builders despise became the head of the corner" (Ps. CXVIII, 22). This stone is compounded of fire, water, and air, and rests on the abyss. Sometimes water flows from it and fills the deep. This stone is set as a sign in the centre of the world.[71]

Zohar II, 222a continues the theme of the foundation stone:

> When the Holy One, blessed be He, was about to create the world, He detached one precious stone[72] from underneath His Throne of Glory and plunged it into the Abyss, one end of it remaining fastened therein whilst the other end stood out above; and this other and superior head constituted the nucleus of the world, the point out of which the world started, spreading itself to right and left and into all directions, and by which it is sustained. That nucleus, that stone, is called *shethyiah* (foundation), as it was the starting-point of the world. The name *shethyiah*, furthermore, is a compound of *shath* (founded) and *Yah* (God), signifying that the Holy One, blessed be He, made it the foundation and starting-point of the world and all that is therein.[73]

We will now examine some important similarities between *2 Enoch* and these Zoharic passages. The text of *2 Enoch* uses the term **бєздна**[74] (literally, "abyss") which also occupied a prominent place in the narrative of the *Zohar*. In the *Zohar*, the Holy One cast a stone into the abyss. *2 Enoch* does not mention that the stone fell into the abyss but does utilize the phrase, "I did not name what fell to the abyss" (28:3), with the implication that this act of the Lord had already taken place.

---

[69] **אבן שתיה**. R. Margaliot, ed., **ספר הזהר** (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 1.461.

[70] **תהומא**. R. Margaliot, ed., **ספר הזהר** (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 1.461.

[71] H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933), 2.399.

[72] **אבנא יקירא**. R. Margaliot, ed., **ספר הזהר** (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 2.443.

[73] H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933), 4.258–259.

[74] **мглам же бєздньімъ**—the clouds of the abyss, or the darkness of the abyss; **оупадъкъ бєздньі**—what fell to the abyss.

Another important motif in relation to the stones in both texts has to do with the theme of "establishing the foundation." *2 Enoch* tells that the stones (stone) are related to the foundation which the Lord has established above the waters.[75] This labeling of stones as "foundation" is very typical for the Zoharic narrative, where the stone is referred to many times as שתיה ("foundation") or אבן שתיה ("foundation stone"). The concept of the "Foundation Stone" occupies a prominent place in several cosmological stories.[76] E. Burrows' research points to the Mesopotamian provenance of the concept of the "Foundation Stone," which symbolizes in these traditions the bond between heaven and earth.[77] Burrows traces the geographical origins of this cosmogonic pattern to "the sanctuaries at Nippur, at Larsa, and probably at Sippar."[78] The possible connection with Sippar is especially important for the Enochic text, if we keep in mind the possible Mesopotamian origin of Enoch's figure, based on the antediluvian king Enmeduranki of Sippar.

Finally, the difference in the number of stones in both texts must also be explained. The *Zohar* tells about one foundation stone, *2 Enoch* speaks about stones.[79] But later in the narrative of *2 Enoch*, the term switches from the plural to the singular, and refers only to one stone: "From the stone I cut off a great fire… (29:3)."[80]

Adoil and Arukhaz: Etymology of the Names

During His instructions in the secrets of creation, the Lord told Enoch that in the beginning of creation he had thought to create a visible creation from the invisible. This process occupies an important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch* and demonstrates in complicated imagery this stage of creation. To assist our inquiry, the following passage must be quoted:

---

[75] **Твердь водрогужих и шсновах врѣхог водъ** (literally—"I erected a firm foundation and established it above the waters").

[76] On the concept of the Foundation Stone, see L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), 5.15; E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," *The Labyrinth* (ed. S.H. Hooke; London, 1935), 45–59; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985), 250ff.

[77] E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," 45–59.

[78] E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," 46–47.

[79] **каменіе.**

[80] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.149.

> The Lord told Enoch: And I thought up the idea of establishing a foundation, to create a visible creation. And I commanded the lowest things: "Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!" And Adoil[81] descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age.[82] And I said to him, "Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible." And he disintegrated himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. To the light I spoke: "You go up higher and be solidified and become the foundation for the highest things." And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And I spoke, I straightened myself upward from my throne. And I called out a second time into the lowest things, and I said, "Let one of the invisible things come out solid and visible." There came out Arukhas,[83] solid and heavy and very black. And I saw how suitable he was. And I said to him, "Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!" And there is nothing lower than the darkness, except nothing itself (24–26).[84]

The passage deals with two enigmatic names, Adoil and Arukhas. Much attention has been devoted to the etymology of these words which might indicate that many scholars consider these names as important cues for clarifying the origins of the text.

R.H. Charles asserts that Adoil might be derived from Hebrew, **יד אל**, translated as "The hand of God."[85] M. Philonenko supports this etymology pointing to some Egyptian parallels in which "les premières créatures naissent du liquide séminal que le démiurge solitaire avait fait jaillir au moyen de sa main."[86]

L. Gry suggests reading Adoil as **אור אל**, "the light of God." In his opinion, some letters in the Hebrew word **אור**, "light," were transformed. *Resh* was changed into *daleth*. *Waw* was transposed. As a result of these transformations, it sounds like Adoil.[87]

A. Vaillant suggests that the name might be derived from a Hebrew word **עד** with a suffix, "his eternity, his aeon."[88] G. Scholem criticizes

---

[81] **ѧдоилъ**.

[82] **вѣка великаго**. It can be also translated as "a great aeon."

[83] **ѧрꙋχазъ**.

[84] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.143–145.

[85] *APOT*, 2.445.

[86] M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969), 114.

[87] See L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 201.

[88] Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, xi.

this rendering and shows that in Hebrew the word **עד** has the peculiar characteristic of being unable to carry a pronominal suffix.[89] According to Scholem's own interpretation Adoil derives from Sadoqil.[90]

J. Milik considers the name Adoil as "a Greek and Semitic hybrid: Hades + El."[91] G. Quispel derives it from *Adonai-el*, where the first element is the circumlocution for the Tetragrammaton.[92]

Another proper name in the narrative, Arukhaz, also poses several problems for interpretation. R.H. Charles believes that Arukhaz may have originated from the Hebrew word **רקיע** ("firmament").[93]

A. Vaillant supports the view that the term "Arukhaz" is connected with the image of foundation (Greek, στερέωμα; Hebrew, **רקיע**). In his opinion it was composed from the Hebrew words **ערוך** "arranged" and **עז** "hard."[94]

J. Milik traced "Arukhaz" to the Hebrew feminine term **ארוכה** ("geographical basin"), transcribed with the masculine flexional ending as Arukhaz.[95]

F. Andersen, while thinking that the name could probably be derived from the Greek word ἀρχή, points out that the ending -as, which is not Slavonic, is doubtful.[96] He opts for another translation that connects the name with a Hebrew word **ערוך** ("extended").[97]

However, some materials found in the *Zohar* might lead us to quite different interpretations of the names "Adoil" and "Arukhas." In the *Zohar* I, 17b one may find some provocative material from the Account of Creation that describes the same stage in the story of creation which began, just as the passage of *2 Enoch*, with the idea of establishing a "foundation":

> Let there be a firmament: i.e. let there be a gradual extension. Thereupon *El* (God), the "right cluster," *El Gadol* (Great God),[98] spread forth from the midst of the waters to complete this name *El* and to combine

---

[89] Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 73.

[90] G. Scholem, "Die Lehre vom 'Gerechten' in der jüdischen Mystik," *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 27 (1958) 252.

[91] J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 113.

[92] Cf. J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 288.

[93] *APOT*, 2.445.

[94] Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, xi–xii.

[95] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 113.

[96] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144–145.

[97] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.145.

[98] **אל גדול**. R. Margaliot, ed., **ספר הזהר** (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 1.34.

> with this extension, and so *El* was extended into *Elohim* (= *El* + *H, Y, M*). These *H, Y, M*, extended and became reversed so as to form lower waters, *Y, M, H*. This extension which took place on the second day is the upper waters. The *hé, yod, mim*, form *hayam* (the sea), which the upper waters. The reversal of these letters, *yamah* (seaward), is the lower waters. When they were firmly established, all became one whole, and this name was extended to a number of places. The upper waters are male and the lower waters female. At first they were commingled,[99] but afterwards they were differentiated into upper and lower waters. This is the meaning of "*Elohim* upper waters," and this is the meaning of "*Adonai* lower waters"; and this is the meaning of upper *Hé* and lower *Hé*.[100]

First, the applicable correlation between this narrative and the passage of *2 Enoch* lies in the similarities between the name "Adail" which is spelled in the majority of Slavonic manuscripts as "Adoil,"[101] and אל גדול—*El gadol* (or *Gadol-el*, "the great one"). Let it be noted that the Slavonic text, after it introduces the name "Adoil," defines it as "the great one" **Ѧдоилъ превеликы ѕѣло**[102] "Adoil, the great one,"[103] which, in Hebrew, is identical with his name.[104]

Second, the title *El Gadol* in the *Zohar* is identified with the upper waters. A similar correspondence can be found in *2 Enoch* where Adoil is matched with the upper foundation.

The same symmetrical pattern also shows in the case of Arukhaz: Arukhaz, the lower foundation in *2 Enoch*, and the "other extension," the lower waters in the *Zohar*. Both texts use the term "lower" in

---

[99] Literally: "there were waters within waters" (הוו מים במים). R. Margaliot, ed., ספר חזחר (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940), 1.34.

[100] H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933), 1.75.

[101] In the majority of MSS this name has a form Adoil (**Ѧдоилъ**) with "o" in the middle of the word:

J – Adoil. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.144.
R – Adoil. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.25.
P – Adoilju. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.25.
U – Adoil'. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.117.
N – Idoil. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, 28.
B – Adoil'; Idoil'. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.91.
B[2] – Adoil. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.137.
Chr – Adoil'. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.150.

[102] Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, 29–30.

[103] Andersen translated it as "extremely large."

[104] The title *El gadol*, "the great God," can be connected with the term "Great Aeon," which came out from the belly of "Great One"—*Adoil*. Compare also *Zohar*'s narrative: "At first there were waters within waters."

reference to Arukhaz. This term can serve as a clue to resolving the etymological mystery of this enigmatic name. The word "Arukhaz" in *2 Enoch* might be related to the Aramaic **ארעיי**, translated as "lower."[105] It is noteworthy that *Frg. Tg.* on Gen 1:6 uses this term in the expression "the lower waters" (**מיא ארעאי**).[106]

Conclusion

It would be helpful now to offer some concluding remarks about the Account of Creation in *2 Enoch*. These inferences will be concerned mainly with the form and the content of the examined textual material.

1. *2 Enoch* appears to contain a systematic tendency of treating the story of creation as containing the most esoteric knowledge. Even though *2 Enoch* deals with various meterological, astronomical, and cosmological revelations, it specifically emphasizes the "secrecy" of the account of creation. *2 Enoch*, unlike other early apocalyptic materials (such as the Book of Daniel and *1 Enoch*), does not include the variety of "revealed things" in the notion of "secrets."

2. *2 Enoch's* emphasis on the "secrecy" of the creation story demonstrates an intriguing parallel to the later rabbinic approach to **מעשה בראשית** as esoteric knowledge. *2 Enoch*, therefore, can be seen as an important step in the shaping of the later rabbinic understanding of "secret things," which eventually led to the esoterism of the Account of Creation.

3. The Account of Creation in *2 Enoch* includes the cosmogonic motifs of God's creation of the primordial order. These descriptions show a number of parallels with late Jewish mysticism, namely the Zoharic tradition. It supports the Box-Odeberg hypothesis, that the creation narrative of the longer recension shows a presentment of some of the Zoharic ideas of creation. At this stage of our research, it is difficult to determine whether these blocks of the Account of Creation are

---

[105] M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990), 77.

[106] M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990), 77.

interpolations during the later stages of transmission or whether they belong to the original layer of the text.

4. The story of Creation appears to be more developed in the manuscripts of the longer recension. To illustrate this fact, we could point to the important description of the creation of Adam[107] in chapters 30–32, which are absent in the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It supports Andersen's position that "the claims of the longer recension need special attention in the sections dealing with creation, chapters 24–33."[108]

[107] Cf. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 51.
[108] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.94.

CELESTIAL CHOIRMASTER: THE LITURGICAL ROLE OF ENOCH-METATRON IN *2 ENOCH* AND THE MERKABAH TRADITION

Introduction

In one of his recent publications, Philip Alexander traces the development of Enoch's image through the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period up to the early Middle Ages.[1] His study points to "a genuine, ongoing tradition" that shows the astonishing persistence of certain motifs. As an example, Alexander explicates the evolution of Enoch's priestly role which was prominent in the Second Temple materials and underwent in the later Merkabah sources further development in Metatron's sacerdotal duties. He observes that "Enoch in *Jubilees* in the second century BCE is a high priest. Almost a thousand years later he retains this role in the Heikhalot texts, though in a rather different setting."[2] Noting the long-lasting association of Enoch-Metatron[3] with

[1] P.S. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 87–122 (102–104); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973), 52–63.

[2] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 107.

[3] On Metatron see, among others, D. Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead," *HTR* 87 (1994) 291–321; P.S. Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28–29 (1977–1978) 156–180; *idem*, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.223–315; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1951), 143–160; M. Black, "The Origin of the Name Metatron," *VT* 1 (1951) 217–219; M.S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983), 124–132; J. Dan, "The Seventy Names of Metatron," in *idem*, *Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity* (2 vols.; Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1998), 1.229–234; *idem*, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1993), 108–124; J.R. Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," in C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila and G.S. Lewis (eds.), *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (SJSJ, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 3–18; *idem*, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in J.R. Davila (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early*

the sacerdotal office, Alexander draws attention to the priestly role of this exalted figure attested in *3 Enoch* 15B where Enoch-Metatron is put in charge of the heavenly tabernacle. The passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* reads:

Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 (STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 248–274; W. Fauth, "Tatrosjah-totrosjah und Metatron in der jüdischen Merkabah-Mystik," *JSJ* 22 (1991) 40–87; C. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 156; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988), 420–427; M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 191–194; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGAJU, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 195–206; M. Himmelfarb, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature," *SBLSP* (1978), 259–269; C. Kaplan, "The Angel of Peace, Uriel–Metatron," *Anglican Theological Review* 13 (1931), 306–313; M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; *idem*, *The Mystical Experience of Abraham Abulafia* (trans. J. Chipman; Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988), 117–119; *idem*, "Metatron-Comments on the Development of Jewish Myth," in H. Pedayah (ed.), *Myth in Jewish Thought* (Beer Sheva: Beer Sheva University Press, 1996) 29–44; S. Lieberman, **שקיעין** (Jerusalem, 1939), 11–16; *idem*, "Metatron, the Meaning of his Name and his Functions," Appendix to Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 235–241; M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ, 34; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992), 394–396; R. Margaliot, **מלאכי עליון** (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1964), 73–108; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 125–135; G.F. Moore, "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron," *HTR* 15 (1922) 41–85; C. Mopsik, *Le Livre hébreu d'Hénoch ou Livre des palais* (Paris: Verdier, 1989), 44–48; C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31(7–11); A. Murtonen, "The Figure of Metatron," *VT* 3 (1953) 409–411; H. Odeberg, "Föreställningarna om Metatron i äldre judisk mystic," *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* 27 (1927), 1–20; *idem*, *3 Enoch, or the Book of Enoch*, 79–146; *idem*, "Enoch," in *TDNT*, 2.556–560; A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; *idem*, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse), of Enoch," *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26; P. Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992), 29–32; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem: Schocken, 1941), 43–55; *idem*, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960), 43–55; *idem*, "Metatron," in *EncJud*, 11.1443–1446; *idem*, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset, 1987), 377–381; *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, 1990), 214–215; A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 60–73; G.G. Stroumsa, "Form(s), of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288; L.T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology* (WUNT, 2.70; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1995), 71–73; I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989), 2.626–632; G. Vajda, "Pour le Dossier de Metatron," in S. Stein and R. Loewe (eds.), *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History Presented to A. Altmann* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1979), 345–354; E.E. Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* (trans. I. Abrahams; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), 1.138–139; 2.743–744; E. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 113, 334; *idem*, "Metatron and Shi^{c}ur Qomah in

> Metatron is the Prince over all princes, and stands before him who is exalted above all gods. He goes beneath the Throne of Glory, where he has a great heavenly tabernacle of light, and brings out the deafening fire, and puts it in the ears of the holy creatures, so that they should not hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.[4]

This passage portrays the translated patriarch as a heavenly priest in the celestial tabernacle located beneath God's *Kavod*. Along with the reference to Metatron's role as the sacerdotal servant, the text also alludes to another, more enigmatic tradition in which this angel is depicted as the one who inserts "the deafening fire" into the ears of the *hayyot* so the holy creatures will not be harmed by the voice of the Almighty. This reference might allude to another distinctive role of the exalted angel, to his office of the celestial choirmaster, that is, one who directs the angelic liturgy taking place before the Throne of Glory. The tradition attested in *3 Enoch* 15B, however, does not explicate this role of Metatron, most likely because of the fragmentary nature of this passage which is considered by scholars as a late addition to *Sefer Hekhalot*.[5] A similar description in *Synopse* 390[6] appears to have preserved better the original tradition about Metatron's unique liturgical role. The text relates:

> One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth (משכן הנער) whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: "The Throne of Glory is shining." Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot*

---

the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz," in K.-E. Grözinger and J. Dan (eds.), *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1995), 60–92.

[4] Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of), Enoch," 303.

[5] The literary integrity of *Sefer Hekhalot* is a complicated issue. The form of the work in the major manuscripts demonstrates "clear signs of editing." Scholars observe that "*3 Enoch* has arisen through the combination of many separate traditions: it tends to break down into smaller 'self-contained' units which probably existed prior to their incorporation into the present work… It is not the total product of a single author at particular point in time, but the deposits of a 'school tradition' which incorporates elements from widely different periods" (Alexander, "3 Enoch," 223). Alexander also observes that "an inspection of the textual tradition shows that chapters 3–15/16, which describe the elevation of Enoch, circulated as an independent tract…and it is intrinsically probable that these chapters formed the core round which the longer recensions grew" (Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," 156–157). The detailed discussion of the literary character of *3 Enoch* and its possible transmission history transcends the boundaries of current investigation.

[6] MS New York JTS 8128.

> put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God's speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices (**שהנער ששמו מטטרון מזכיר באות׳ שעה בשבעה קולות**), his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.[7]

Here again the themes of Metatron's priesthood in the heavenly tabernacle and his duty of bringing the fire of deafness to the *hayyot* are conflated. This passage also indicates that Metatron is not only the one who protects and prepares the heavenly hosts for their praise to the deity,[8] but also the choirmaster who himself conducts the liturgical ceremony by invoking the divine name. The passage underlines the extraordinary scope of Metatron's own vocal abilities that allow him to invoke the deity's name in seven voices. Yet the portrayal of this celestial choirmaster intentionally "deafening" the members of his own choir might appear puzzling. A close examination of Hekhalot liturgical theology may however help clarify the paradoxal imagery. Peter Schäfer points out that in the Hekhalot writings "the heavenly praise is directed solely toward God" since "for all others who hear it—men as well as angels—it can be destructive."[9] As an example, Schäfer refers to a passage from *Hekhalot Rabbati* which offers a chain of warnings about the grave dangers encountered by those who dare to hear the angelic praise.[10] James Davila's recent study also confirms the importance of the motif of the dangerous encounters in the course of the heavenly worship in Hekhalot liturgical settings.[11]

---

[7] Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 164.

[8] Another Hekhalot passage attested in *Synopse* §385 also elaborates the liturgical role of the exalted angel: "…when the youth enters below the Throne of Glory, God embraces him with a shining face. All the angels gather and address God as 'the great, mighty, awesome God,' and they praise God three times a day by means of the youth (**ומשבחים הק׳ב׳ה׳ שלשה פעמים בכל יום על יד הנער**)…." Schäfer, *Synopse*, 162–163.

[9] Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 25.

[10] *Synopse* 104 reads: "The voice of the first one: one who hears [this] voice, will immediately go mad and tumble down. The voice of the second one: everyone who hears it, immediately goes astray and does not return. The voice of the third one: one who hears [this] voice is struck by cramps and he dies immediately…." Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 25.

[11] On this motif of the dangerous encounters with the divine in the Hekhalot literature, see J.R. Davila, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (SJSJ, 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 136–139.

This motif may constitute one of the main reasons for Metatron's preventive ritual of putting the deafening fire into the ears of the holy creatures.[12] It is also helpful to realize that Youth-Metatron's role of safeguarding the angelic hosts stems directly from his duties as the liturgical servant and the director of angelic hosts.

It should be stressed that while Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office plays a prominent role in the Merkabah lore, this tradition appears to be absent in early Enochic texts, including the compositions collected in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants*. Despite this apparent absence, this study will argue that the roots of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery can be traced to the Second Temple Enochic lore, namely, to *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. Some traditions found in this text appear to serve as the initial background for the developments of the future liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron as the celestial choirmaster. This study will focus on investigating these developments.

Priestly Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Patriarch in Early Enochic Traditions

Before this study proceeds to a detailed analysis of the liturgical role of the translated patriarch in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah tradition, a brief introduction to the priestly and liturgical function of the seventh antediluvian hero in the pseudepigraphical materials is needed.

In early Enochic booklets the seventh antediluvian patriarch is closely associated with the celestial sanctuary located, as in the later Merkabah lore, in the immediate proximity to the Divine Throne. Enoch's affiliations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36), the *Book of Dreams* (*1 En.* 83–90), and the book of *Jubilees* can be seen as the gradual evolution from the implicit references to his heavenly priesthood in the earliest Enochic materials to a more overt recognition and description of his sacerdotal function in the later ones. While later Enochic traditions attested in the book of *Jubilees* unambiguously point to Enoch's priestly role by referring to his incense sacrifice in the celestial sanctuary, the earlier associations of the patri-

[12] It appears that the angelic hosts must be protected, not for the whole course of the celestial liturgy, but only during the invocation of the divine name. Cf. M.S. Cohen, *The Shi ʿur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985), 162–163.

arch with the heavenly Temple hinted at in the *Book of the Watchers* took the form of rather enigmatic depictions. A certain amount of exegetical work is, therefore, required to discern the proper meaning of these initial associations of the patriarch with the celestial sanctuary.

Martha Himmelfarb's research helps to clarify Enoch's possible connections with the celestial sanctuary in the *Book of the Watchers*, the account of which appears to fashion the ascension of the seventh antediluvian patriarch to the Throne of Glory as a visitation of the heavenly Temple.[13] *1 Enoch* 14.9–18 reads:

> And I proceeded until I came near to *a wall* which was built of hailstones, and a tongue of fire surrounded it, and it began to make me afraid. And I went into the tongue of fire and came near to *a large house* which was built of hailstones, and the wall of that house (was) like a mosaic (made) of hailstones, and its floor (was) snow. Its roof (was) like the path of the stars and flashes of lightning, and among them (were) fiery Cherubim, and their heaven (was like) water. And (there was) a fire burning around its wall, and its door was ablaze with fire. And I went into that house, and (it was) hot as fire and cold as snow, and there was neither pleasure nor life in it. Fear covered me and trembling, I fell on my face. And I saw in the vision, and behold, *another house*, which was larger that the former, and all its doors (were) open before me, and (it was) built of a tongue of fire. And in everything it so excelled in glory and splendor and size that I am unable to describe for you its glory and its size. And its floor (was) fire, and above (were) lightning and the path of the stars, and its roof also (was) a burning fire. And I looked and I saw in it a high throne, and its appearance (was) like ice and its surrounds like the shining sun and the sound of Cherubim.[14]

---

[13] M. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira," in Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley (eds.), *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 63–78; *idem*, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987) 210–217. Himmelfarb's research draws on the previous publications of J. Maier and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; cf. J. Maier, "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apocalyptik und 'Gnosis,'" *Kairos* 5.1 (1963) 18–40, (23); *idem*, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis*: *Studien zur Vor-und Frühgeschichte der "Judischen Gnosis." Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabah* (Kairos, 1; Salzburg: Müller, 1964), 127–128; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee" *JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600 (576–582). Cf. also H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 101–102; Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 81.

[14] M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 1.50–52; 2.98–99.

Commenting on this passage, Himmelfarb draws attention to the description of the celestial edifices which Enoch encounters in his approach to the Throne. She notes that the Ethiopic text reports that, in order to reach God's Throne, the patriarch passes through three celestial constructions: a wall, an outer house, and an inner house. The Greek version of this narrative mentions a house instead of a wall. Himmelfarb observes that "more clearly in the Greek, but also in the Ethiopic this arrangement echoes the structure of the earthly temple with its vestibule (אולם), sanctuary (היכל), and holy of holies (דביר)."[15] God's Throne is located in the innermost chamber of this heavenly structure and is represented by a throne of cherubim. It can be seen as a heavenly counterpart to the cherubim found in the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem Temple.[16] In drawing parallels between the descriptions of the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and the features of the earthly sanctuary, Himmelfarb observes that the "fiery cherubim" which Enoch sees on the ceiling of the first house (Ethiopic) or middle house (Greek) of the heavenly structure represent, not the cherubim of the divine Throne, but images that recall the figures on the hangings on the wall of the terrestrial tabernacle mentioned in Exod. 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35 or possibly the figures which, according 1 Kgs 6:29, 2 Chron. 3:7 and Ezek. 41:15–26, were engraved on the walls of the earthly Temple.[17]

---

[15] Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 210.

[16] One comment must be made about the early traditions and sources that may lie behind the descriptions of the upper sanctuary in *1 En.* 14. Scholars observe that the idea of heaven as a temple was not invented by the author of the *Book of the Watchers* since the concept of the heavenly temple as a heavenly counterpart of the earthly sanctuary was widespread in the ancient Near East and appears in a number of biblical sources. Cf. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden," 68. Students of Jewish priestly traditions previously noted that the existence of such a conception of the heavenly sanctuary appears to become increasingly important in the times of religious crises when the earthly sanctuaries were either destroyed or "defiled" by "improper" rituals or priestly successions. For an extensive discussion of this subject, see B. Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community Without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT, 118; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999); R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions," *JSQ* 4 (1997) 217–267; *idem*, "The Priestly Nature of the Mystical Heritage in Heykalot Literature," in R.B. Fenton and R. Goetschel (eds.), *Expérience et écriture mystiques dans les religions du livre: Actes d'un colloque international tenu par le Centre d'études juives Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne 1994* (EJM, 22; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 41–54.

[17] Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 211.

Several words must be said about the servants of the heavenly sanctuary depicted in *1 Enoch* 14. Himmelfarb observes that the priests of the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* appear to be represented by angels, since the author of the text depicts them as the ones "standing before God's Throne in the heavenly temple."[18] She also points to the possibility that in the *Book of the Watchers* the patriarch himself in the course of his ascent becomes a priest[19] similarly to the angels."[20] In this perspective, the angelic status of the patriarch and his priestly role[21] are viewed as mutually interconnected. Himmelfarb stresses that "the author of the *Book of the Watchers* claims angelic status for Enoch through his service in the heavenly temple" since "the ascent shows

[18] Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 211. David Halperin also supports this position. In his view, "the angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch's heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings" (Haplerin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 82).

[19] Halperin's studies also stress the apocalyptic priestly function of Enoch in the *Book of the Watchers*. He observes that "Daniel and Enoch share an image, perhaps drawn from the hymnic tradition of merkabah exegesis (think of the Angelic liturgy), of God surrounded by multitudes of angels. But, in the Holy of Holies, God sits alone…. The angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch's heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings" (Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 81–82).

[20] Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 213.

[21] George Nickelsburg's earlier study on the temple symbolism in *1 En.* 14 provides some important additional details relevant to our ongoing discussion. Nickelsburg argues that Enoch's "active" involvement in the vision of the Lord's Throne, when he passes through the chambers of the celestial sanctuary, might indicate that the author(s), of the *Book of the Watchers* perceived him as a servant associated with the activities in these chambers. Nickelsburg points to the fact that Enoch's vision of the Throne in the *Book of the Watchers* is "qualitatively different from that described in the biblical throne visions" by way of the new active role of its visionary. This new, active participation of Enoch in the vision puts *1 En.* 14 closer to later Merkabah accounts which are different from biblical visions. Nickelsburg stresses that in the biblical throne visions, the seer is passive or, at best, his participation is reactional. In contrast, in the Merkabah accounts, Enoch appears to be actively involved in his vision. In Nickelsburg's view, the verbal forms of the narrative ("I *drew near* the wall," "I *went into* that house"), serve as further indications of the active "participation" of the seer in the visionary "reality" of the heavenly Throne/Temple. On the other hand, biblical visions are not completely forgotten by Enochic authors and provide an important exegetical framework for *1 En.* 14. Comparing the Enochic vision with the Ezekelian account of the temple, Nickelsburg suggests that the Enochic narrative also represents a vision of the temple, but, in this case, the heavenly one. He argues that "the similarities to Ezek. 40–48, together with other evidence, indicate that Enoch is describing his ascent to the heavenly temple and his progress through its *temenos* to the door of the holy of holies, where the chariot throne of God is set" (Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 579–581).

him passing through the outer court of the temple and the sanctuary to the door of the holy of holies, where God addresses him with his own mouth."[22] It is important for our investigation to note that, despite the fact that Enoch appears to be envisioned as an angel by the authors of the text, nothing is said about his leading role in the angelic liturgy.

The traditions about the seventh patriarch's heavenly priesthood are not confined solely to the materials found in the *Book of the Watchers*, since they are attested in other *1 Enoch*'s materials, including the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 85–90).

It is noteworthy that, whereas in the *Book of the Watchers* Enoch's associations with the heavenly Temple are clothed with rather ambiguous imagery, his depictions in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not leave any serious doubts that some of the early Enochic traditions understood Enoch to be intimately connected with the heavenly sanctuary.

Chapter 87 of *1 Enoch* portrays the patriarch taken by three angels from the earth and raised to a high tower, where he is expected to remain until he will see the judgment prepared for the Watchers and their earthly families. *1 Enoch* 87:3–4 reads:

> And those three who came out last took hold of me by my hand, and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me on to a high place, and showed me *a tower* high above the earth, and all the hills were lower. And one said to me: "Remain here until you have seen everything which is coming upon these elephants and camels and asses, and upon the stars, and upon all the bulls."[23]

James VanderKam notes a significant detail in this description, namely, Enoch's association with a tower. He observes that this term[24] is reserved in the *Animal Apocalypse* for a Temple.[25] The association of the patriarch with the tower is long-lasting, and apparently he must have spent there a considerable amount of time, since the text does not

---

[22] Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 212.

[23] Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 1.294; 2.198.

[24] Cf. *1 En.* 89:50: "And that house became large and broad, and for those sheep a high tower was built on that house for the Lord of the sheep; and that house was low, but the tower was raised up and high; and the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower, and they spread a full table before him" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.208); *1 En.* 89.73: "And they began again to build, as before, and they raised up that tower, and it was called the high tower; and they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it (was), unclean and was not pure" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.211).

[25] J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 117.

say anything about Enoch's return to the earth again until the time of judgment. So the patriarch is depicted as present in the heavenly sanctuary for most of the *Animal Apocalypse*.[26]

Although the traditions about Enoch's associations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not refer explicitly to his performance of the priestly duties, the account attested in the book of *Jubilees* explicitly makes this reference.

Jubilees 4:23 depicts Enoch to be taken from human society and placed in Eden[27] "for (his) greatness and honor."[28] The Garden is then defined as a sanctuary[29] and Enoch as one who is offering an incense sacrifice on the mountain of incense: "He burned the evening incense[30] of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense."[31]

VanderKam suggests that here Enoch is depicted as one who "performs the rites of a priest in the temple."[32] Furthermore, he observes that Enoch's priestly duties represent a new element in "Enoch's expanding portfolio."[33]

---

[26] VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117.

[27] For Enoch's place in the heavenly Paradise, see *Testament of Benjamin* 10:6; *Apocalypse of Paul* 20; *Clementine Recognitions* 1:52; *Acts of Pilate* 25; and the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:6. Cf. C. Rowland, "Enoch," in K. van der Toorn *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 302.

[28] J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 2.28.

[29] VanderKam argues that there are other indications that in the book *of Jubilees* Eden was understood as a sanctuary. As an example, he points to Jub. 3.9–14, which "derives the law from Lev 11 regarding when a women who has given birth may enter the sanctuary from the two times when Adam and Eve, respectively, went into the garden" (VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generation*, 117).

[30] One must note the peculiar details surrounding the depiction of Enoch's priestly duties in early Enochic lore. While the *Book of the Watchers* does not refer to any liturgical or sacrificial rituals of the patriarch, *Jubilees* depicts the patriarch offering incense to God. The absence of references to any animal sacrificial or liturgical practice in Enoch's sacerdotal duties might indicate that his office may have been understood by early Enochic traditions to be of the "divinatory angle," that is, as the office of oracle-priest, practiced also by the Mesopotamian diviners who, similarly to Enoch's preoccupation with incense, widely used the ritual of libanomancy, or smoke divination, a "practice of throwing cedar shavings onto a censer in order to observe the patterns and direction of the smoke" (M.S. Moore, *The Balaam Traditions: Their Character and Development* [SBLDS, 113; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990], 43).

[31] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.28.

[32] VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117.

[33] VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117. Scholars point to the possible polemical nature of the patriarch's priestly role. Gabriele Boccaccini observes that

The purpose of the aforementioned analysis was to demonstrate that, despite the fact that the early Enochic materials found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* emphasize the patriarch's association with the heavenly sanctuary, they do not contain any references to his role in directing the celestial liturgy. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the priestly duties of Enoch-Metatron are often juxtaposed with his liturgical activities, early Enochic lore does not link these two sacerdotal functions. Moreover, it appears that in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* Enoch does not play any leading role in the celestial liturgy. Thus, for example, in the *Book of the Similitudes* (*1 En.* 37–71), where the celestial liturgy plays an important part, the patriarch does not play any significant role (*1 En.* 39). Moreover, the text stresses that Enoch is unable to sustain the frightening "Presence" of the deity. In *1 Enoch* 39:14 the patriarch laments that during celestial liturgy his "face was transformed" until he was not able to see.[34] This lament makes clear that Enoch's capacities can in no way be compared with Metatron-Youth's potentialities which are able not only to sustain the terrifying Presence of the deity but also to protect others, including the angelic hosts during the celestial liturgy.

These conceptual developments indicate that in the early Enochic materials the leading role of the translated patriarch in the sacerdotal settings remains solely priestly, but not liturgical. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the theme of the celestial sanctuary (the tabernacle of the Youth) is often conflated with Metatron's role as the celestial choirmaster, the early Enochic materials associated with *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* show only one side of the story. Our study must now proceed to the testimonies about Metatron's priestly and liturgical activities in the Hekhalot and the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials.

"Enochians completely ignore the Mosaic torah and the Jerusalem Temple, that is the two tenets of the order of the universe." In his opinion, "the attribution to Enoch of priestly characteristics suggests the existence of a pure prediluvian, and pre-fall, priesthood and disrupts the foundation of the Zadokite priesthood, which claimed its origin in Aaron at the time of exodus, in an age that, for the Enochians, was already corrupted after the angelic sin and the flood" (G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 74).

[34] Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.127.

Tabernacle of the Youth: Priestly and Liturgical Roles of Enoch-Metatron in the Merkabah Tradition

It has been already mentioned that, in contrast to the early Enochic booklets which do not provide any hints as to Enoch's leading role in the heavenly liturgy, in the Merkabah tradition the priestly role of Enoch-Metatron is closely intertwined with his pivotal place in the course of the angelic worship. Since both of these sacerdotal functions are closely interconnected, before we proceed to a detailed analysis of the liturgical imagery associated with this exalted angel, we must explore Metatron's priestly duties, which in many respects echo and develop further the earlier Enochic traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Heavenly High Priest

While the early Enochic materials depict the seventh antediluvian patriarch as a newcomer who just arrives to his new appointment in the heavenly sanctuary, the Merkabah materials portray Metatron as an established celestial citizen who is firmly placed in his sacerdotal office and even possesses his own heavenly sanctuary that now bears his name. Thus in the passage found in *Merkabah Shelemah* the heavenly tabernacle is called the "tabernacle of Metatron" (משכן מטטרון). In the tradition preserved in *Num. R.* 12.12, the heavenly sanctuary again is associated with one of Metatron's designations and is named the "tabernacle of the Youth" (משכן הנער):[35]

> R. Simon expounded: When the Holy One, blessed be He, told Israel to set up the Tabernacle He intimated to the ministering angels that they also should make a Tabernacle, and the one below was erected the other was erected on high. The latter was *the tabernacle of the youth* (משכן הנער) whose name was Metatron, and therein he offers up the souls of the righteous to atone for Israel in the days of their exile.[36]

This close association between the exalted angel and the upper sanctuary becomes quite widespread in the Hekhalot lore where the celestial Temple is often called the tabernacle of the Youth.[37]

---

[35] It should be noted that the expression "the tabernacle of the Youth" occurs also in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. For a detailed analysis of the Metatron imagery in this tradition, see Cohen, *Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 124–132.

[36] *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961), 5.482–483.

[37] Cf. *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164; *Sid. R.* 37–46.

A significant detail of the rabbinic and Hekhalot descriptions of the tabernacle of the Youth is that this structure is placed in the immediate proximity to the Throne, more precisely right beneath the seat of Glory.[38] As mentioned in the introduction, *3 Enoch* 15B locates Enoch-Metatron's "great heavenly tabernacle of light" beneath the Throne of Glory.[39] This tradition appears to be not confined solely to the description attested in *3 Enoch* since several Hekhalot passages depict Youth (who often is identified there with Metatron)[40] as the one who emerges from beneath the Throne.[41] The proximity of the tabernacle to *Kavod* recalls the early Enochic materials, more specifically *1 Enoch* 14, where the patriarch's visitation of the celestial sanctuary is described as his approach to God's Throne. Both Enochic and Hekhalot traditions seem to allude here to Enoch-Metatron's role as the celestial high priest since he approaches the realm where the ordinary angelic or human creatures are not allowed to enter, namely, the realm of the immediate Presence of the deity, the place of the Holy of Holies, which is situated behind the veil, represented by heavenly (**פרגוד**)[42] or terrestrial (**פרכת**) curtains. Metatron's service behind the heavenly curtain parallels the unique function of the earthly high priest who alone was allowed to enter behind the veil of the terrestrial sanctuary.[43] It has been mentioned that the possible background of this unique role of Metatron can

[38] *3 En.* 8.1: "R. Ishmael said: Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to me: Before the Holy One, blessed be he, set me to serve the throne of glory…." (Alexander, "3 Enoch," 262). Metatron's prominent role might be also reflected in the fragment found on one magic bowl where he is called **איסרא רבא דכורסיה** ("the great prince of the throne"); see C. Gordon, "Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums," *Archiv Orientálni* 6 (1934) 319–334 (328).

[39] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 303.

[40] On the title "Youth" in the Hekhalot literature, see Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," 254–266, and Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 491–494.

[41] Cf., for example, *Synopse* 385: "when *the youth enters beneath the throne of glory* (**נכנס הנער לתחת כסא הכבוד**)" (Schäfer, *Synopse*, p. 162). Another text preserved in the *Cairo Genizah* also depicts the "youth" as emerging from his sacerdotal place in the immediate Presence of the deity: "Now, see the youth, who is going forth to meet you *from behind the throne of glory*. Do not bow down to him, because his crown is like the crown of his King…" (P. Schäfer, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* [TSAJ, 6; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1984)], 2b.13–14).

[42] On the imagery of the celestial curtain, see also b. Yom. 77a; b. Ber. 18b; *3 En.* 45.1.

[43] On the celestial curtain *Pargod* as the heavenly counterpart of the *paroket*, the veil of the Jerusalem Temple, see D. Halperin, *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature* (AOS, 62; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980), 169 n. 99; C.R.A. Morray-Jones, *A Transparent Illusion: The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 164–168.

be traced to the Enochic materials, more specifically to *1 Enoch* 14 where the patriarch alone appears in the celestial Holy of Holies while the other angels are barred from the inner house. This depiction also correlates with the Hekhalot evidence according to which only the Youth, that is, Metatron, similarly to the earthly high priest, is allowed to serve before as well as behind the heavenly veil. The inscription on one Mandean bowl describes Metatron as the attendant "who serves before the Curtain."[44] Philip Alexander observes that this definition "may be linked to the Hekhalot tradition about Metatron as the heavenly High Priest … and certainly alludes to his status as 'Prince of the Divine Presence.'"[45] It is true that Metatron's role as the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face (*Sar ha-Panim*) cannot be separated from his priestly and liturgical duties since both the tabernacle of this exalted angel and the divine liturgy that he is conducting are situated in the immediate proximity to God's Presence, also known as his Face. In relation to our investigation of the liturgical imagery, it is worth noting that by virtue of being God's *Sar ha-Panim* Youth-Metatron can unconditionally approach the Presence of the deity without harm for himself, a unique privilege denied to the rest of the created order. He is also allowed to go behind the Curtain and behold the Face of God,[46] as well as to hear the voice of the deity. This is why he is able to protect the *hayyot* against the harmful effects of the Divine Presence in the course of the angelic liturgy. Such imagery points to the fact that Metatron's bold approach to the Divine Presence is predetermined, not only by his special role as the celestial High Priest, but also by his privileges in the office of the Prince of the Divine Presence.

It should be noted that, in contrast to the early Enochic traditions which hesitate to name explicitly the exalted patriarch as the high priest, the Merkabah materials directly apply this designation to Metatron. Rachel Elior observes that Metatron appears in the *Genizah* documents as a high priest who offers sacrifices on the heavenly altar.[47] She draws attention to the important testimony attested in one *Cairo Genizah* text which labels Metatron as the high priest and the chief of the priests. The text reads:

---

[44] W.S. McCullough, *Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Texts in the Royal Ontario Museum* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), D 5–6.

[45] Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," 166.

[46] The passage found in *Synopse* 385 relates: "when the youth enters beneath the throne of glory, God embraces him with a shining face."

[47] Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," 228.

> I adjure you [Metatron], more beloved and dear than all heavenly beings, [Faithful servant] of the God of Israel, the High Priest (כהן גדול), chief of [the priest]s (ראש [הכהני]ם), you who poss[ess seven]ty names; and whose name[is like your Master's] … Great Prince, who is appointed over the great princes, who is the head of all the camps.[48]

It is also noteworthy that Metatron's role as the heavenly high priest appears to be supported in the Hekhalot materials by the motif of the peculiar sacerdotal duties of the terrestrial protagonist of the Hekhalot literature, Rabbi Ishmael b. Elisha, to whom Metatron serves as an *angelus interpres*. In view of Enoch-Metatron sacerdotal affiliations, it is not coincidental that Rabbi Ishmael is the tanna who is attested in b. Ber. 7a as a high priest.[49] R. Elior observes that in *Hekhalot Rabbati* this rabbinic authority is portrayed in terms similar to those used in the Talmud, that is, as a priest burning an offering on the altar.[50] Other Hekhalot materials, including *3 Enoch*,[51] also often refer to R. Ishmael's priestly origins. The priestly features of this visionary might not only reflect the heavenly priesthood of Metatron[52] but also allude to the former priestly duties of the patriarch Enoch known from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, since some scholars note that "*3 Enoch* presents a significant parallelism between the ascension of Ishmael and the ascension of Enoch."[53]

---

[48] L.H. Schiffman and M.D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Semitic Texts and Studies, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 145–147, 151. On Metatron as the high priest, see Schiffman and Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts*, 25–28, 145–147, 156–157; Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," 299 n. 30. Al-Qirquisani alludes to the evidence from the Talmud about the priestly function of Metatron. See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (trans. H. Szold; 7 vols.; Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 6.74.

[49] Cf. also *b*. Ket. 105b; *b*. Hull. 49a.

[50] Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," 225.

[51] Cf., e.g., *3 En*. 2.3: "Metatron replied, 'He [R. Ishmael] is of the tribe of Levi, which presents the offering to his name. He is of the family of Aaron, whom the Holy One, blessed be he, chose to minister in his presence and on whose head he himself placed the priestly crown on Sinai'" (Alexander, "3 Enoch," 257).

[52] N. Deutsch observes that in *3 Enoch* "likewise, as the heavenly high priest, Metatron serves as the mythological prototype of Merkabah mystics such as Rabbi Ishmael. Metatron's role as a high priest highlights the functional parallel between the angelic vice regent and the human mystic (both are priests), whereas his transformation from a human being into an angel reflects an ontological process which may be repeated by mystics via their own enthronement and angelification" (N. Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity* [BSJS, 22; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 34).

[53] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 106–107.

Celestial Choirmaster

Unlike the early Enochic booklets that unveil only the patriarch's leading role in the priestly settings, the Merkabah materials emphasize another important dimension of his activities in the divine worship, namely, the liturgical aspect of his celestial duties. The passages from *3 Enoch* 15B and *Synopse* §390 that began our investigation show that one of the features of Metatron's service in the heavenly realm involves his leadership over the angelic hosts delivering heavenly praise to the deity. Metatron is portrayed there not just as a servant in the celestial tabernacle or the heavenly high priest, but also as the leader of the heavenly liturgy. The evidences that unfold Metatron's liturgical role are not confined solely to the Hekhalot corpus, but can also be detected in another prominent literary stream associated with early Jewish mysticism which is represented by the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. The passages found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* texts attest to a familiar tradition in which Metatron is posited as a liturgical servant. Thus, *Sefer Haqqomah* 155–164 reads:

> And (the) angels who are with him come and encircle the Throne of Glory. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is on the Throne of Glory in the center. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad whose name is Metatron and says in a great voice, a thin voice of silence, "The Throne of Glory is glistening!" Immediately, the angels fall silent and the *'irin* and the *qadushin* are still. They hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the celestial creatures turn their faces towards the earth, and this lad whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of deafness and puts (it) in the ears of the celestial creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy name.[54]

A similar tradition can be found in *Siddur Rabbah* 37–46, another text associated with *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition, where the angelic Youth however is not identified with the angel Metatron:

> The angels who are with him come and encircle the (Throne of) Glory; they are on one side and the celestial creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is in the center. And one creature ascends above the Throne of Glory and touches the seraphim and descends on the Tabernacle of the Lad and declares in a great voice, (which is also) a

[54] Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah*, 162–164.

> voice of silence, "The throne alone shall I exalt over him." The *ofanim* become silent (and) the seraphim are still. The platoons of *ʿirin* and *qadushin* are shoved into the River of Fire and the celestial creatures turn their faces downward, and the lad brings the fire silently and puts it in their ears so that they do not hear the spoken voice; he remains (thereupon) alone. And the lad calls Him, "the great, mighty and awesome, noble, strong, powerful, pure and holy, and the strong and precious and worthy, shining and innocent, beloved and wondrous and exalted and supernal and resplendent God."[55]

In reference to these materials M. Cohen notes that in the *Shiʿur Qomah* tradition Metatron's service in the heavenly tabernacle appears to be "entirely liturgical" and "is more the heavenly choirmaster and beadle than the celestial high priest."[56]

It is evident that the tradition preserved in *Sefer Haqqomah* cannot be separated from the microforms found in *Synopse* 390 and *3 Enoch* 15B since all these narratives are unified by a similar structure and terminology. All of them also emphasize the Youth's leading role in the course of the celestial service. It is also significant that Metatron's role as the one who is responsible for the protection and encouragement of the servants delivering praise to the deity is not confined only to the aforementioned passages, but finds support in the broader context of the Hekhalot and *Shiʿur Qomah* materials.[57]

Thus, in the Hekhalot corpus, Metatron's duties as the choirmaster or the celestial liturgical director appear to be applied, not only to his leadership over angelic hosts, but also over humans, specifically the visionaries who are lucky enough to overcome the angelic opposition and be admitted into the heavenly realm. In *3 En.* 1.9–10 Enoch-Metatron is depicted as the one who "prepares" one of such visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael, for singing praise to the Holy One:

> At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, came and revived me and raised me to my feet, but still I had no strength enough to sing a hymn before the glorious throne of the glorious King…[58]

---

[55] Cohen, *The Shiʿur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 162–164. On the relation of this passage to the Youth tradition see Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," 248–274.

[56] Cohen, *The Shiʿur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 134.

[57] This tradition is not forgotten in the later Jewish mystical developments. Thus, Daniel Abrams notes that in *Sefer ha-Hashek* "Metatron commands the angels to praise the King of the Glory, and he is among them." Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology," 304.

[58] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 256. Peter Schäfer suggests that Ishmael's example stresses

It is possible that these descriptions of Enoch-Metatron as the one who encourages angels and humans to perform heavenly praise in front of God's Presence might have their roots in early Second Temple materials. Our investigation must now turn to analyzing some of these early developments that might constitute the early background of the Merkabah liturgical imagery.

The Beginnings: Liturgical Role of Enoch in Slavonic Apocalypse

One of the texts which might contain early traces of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery is *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, the Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. In contrast to other early Enochic materials, such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, which emphasize only one side of the patriarch's heavenly service through the reference to Enoch's priestly activities, the Slavonic text appears to encompass both sacerdotal dimensions—priestly as well as liturgical. Allusions to the priestly office of the seventh antediluvian hero in the Slavonic text demonstrate marked difference in comparison with the testimonies found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Thus, unlike the aforementioned Enochic tracts, *2 Enoch* does not associate the translated patriarch with any celestial structure that might remotely resemble the descriptions found in *1 Enoch* 14 and 87. On the other hand, the Slavonic text contains a number of other indirect testimonies that demonstrate that the authors of this apocalypse were cognizant of the patriarch's priestly role. Thus, scholars previously observed that Enoch's anointing with shining oil and his clothing into the luminous garments during his angelic metamorphosis in *2 Enoch* 22 appear to resemble the priestly vesture.[59] Another possible sacerdotal association comes from *2 Enoch* 67–69 where the descendents of the seventh antediluvian patriarch, including his son Methuselah, are depicted as the builders of the altar which is erected on the place where Enoch was taken up to heaven. The choice of the location for the terrestrial sanctuary might allude to the peculiar role of the patriarch in relation to the heavenly counterpart of this earthly structure.

---

the connection between heavenly and earthly liturgies; cf. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 132.

[59] M. Himmelfarb observes that "the combination of clothing and anointing suggests that the process by which Enoch becomes an angel is a heavenly version of priestly investiture" (M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* [New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993], 40).

The Slavonic text also appears to refer to the sacerdotal office of Enoch by portraying the patriarch as the one who in *2 Enoch* 59 delivers the sacrificial instructions to his children. All these testimonies show that *2 Enoch*'s authors were familiar with the traditions about the priestly affiliations of the seventh antediluvian hero attested also in the early Enochic booklets. However, in contrast to these early materials that mention only Enoch's priestly role, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse also appear to have knowledge about another prominent office of the translated patriarch—his liturgical activities and his role as the one who encourages and directs the celestial hosts in their daily praise of the creator.

Entertaining this possibility of the Enochic origins of Metatron's role as the leader of the divine worship, we must direct our attention to the passage found in *2 Enoch* 18 where the patriarch is depicted as the one who encourages the celestial Watchers to conduct liturgy before the face of God. The longer recension of *2 En.* 18.8–9 relates:

> And I [Enoch] said, "Why are you waiting for your brothers? And why don't you *perform the liturgy*[60] before the face of the Lord? Start up *your liturgy*,[61] and perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord, so that you do not enrage your Lord to the limit." And they responded to my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in this heaven. And behold, while I was standing with those men, 4 trumpets trumpeted in unison with a great sound, and the Watchers burst into singing in unison. And their voice rose in front of the face of the Lord, piteously and touchingly.[62]

One can notice that the imagery of this account represents a vague sketch that only distantly alludes to the future prominent liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron. Yet here, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, the seventh antediluvian patriarch dares to assemble and direct the angelic creatures for their routine job of delivering praise to the deity. The choice of the angelic group, of course, is not coincidental since in various Enochic materials the patriarch is often described as a

---

[60] Slav. **слоужите**. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih* 4 (1910), 16.

[61] Slav. **слоужби ваше**. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature," 16.

[62] F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *OTP*, 1.91–221 (132).

special envoy to the Watchers, the fallen angels, as well as their faithful celestial brothers.

It is significant that, despite the fact that in *2 Enoch* 18 the patriarch gives his advise to the angels situated in the Fifth Heaven, he repeatedly advises them to start liturgy "before the Face of the Lord," that is, in front of the divine *Kavod*, the exact location where Youth-Metatron will later conduct the heavenly worship of the angelic hosts in the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot accounts.

The shorter recension of the Slavonic text[63] adds several significant details among which Enoch's advice to the Watchers to "perform the liturgy in the name of fire"[64] can be found. This peculiar terminology involving the symbolism of fire appears to allude to the concepts found in the aforementioned Hekhalot liturgical accounts where the imagery of fire, in the form of the references to the *deafening fire* and angels "bathing" in the fire, plays an important role. The shorter recension also stresses the importance of Enoch's leading role, specifically underscoring that the angels needed "the earnestness" of his recommendation.[65]

The reference of *2 Enoch* 18 to the later Youth-Metatron office as the heavenly choirmaster does not appear to be happenstance, since the Slavonic apocalypse alludes to some additional features that recall the later Merkabah liturgical developments. The present study will concentrate on two of such characteristics that enhance Enoch's connection with his newly acquired liturgical office. Both of them are linked to Enoch-Metatron's designations, namely, his titles as "Youth" and the "Servant of the Divine Presence," which appear here for the first time in the Enochic tradition. These titles seem to have direct connection to the liturgical imagery found in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials where the offices of the Youth and *Sar ha-Panim* help unfold Metatron's liturgical activities. Our study must now proceed to the investigation of these two titles in *2 Enoch's* materials.

---

[63] The shorter recension of *2 En.* 18.8–9 reads: "'And why don't you perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord? Start up the former liturgy. Perform the liturgy in the name of fire (*vo imja ogne*), lest you annoy the Lord your God (so that), he throws you down from this place.' And they heeded the earnestness of my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in heaven. And behold, while I was standing, they sounded with 4 trumpets in unison, and the Grigori began to perform the liturgy as with one voice. And their voices rose up in the Lord's presence" (Andersen, "2 Enoch," 133).

[64] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 133.

[65] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 133.

The Servant of God's Face

It has been already observed that Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties cannot be separated from his office as the *Sar ha-Panim*, the one who can approach God's Presence without limit and hesitation. It is not surprising that in *2 Enoch*, which attests to the origins of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery, one can also find for the first time in the Enochic tradition an explicit reference to the patriarch's role as the Servant of the Divine Presence.[66]

Hugo Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of "the Prince of the Presence" in the long recension of *2 Enoch*. He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of the parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch* that the phrase "stand before my face forever" found in the Slavonic apocalypse does not serve there merely as a typical Hebraism, "to be in the presence," but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, שר הפנים.[67] In *2 Enoch* therefore the patriarch is depicted not as one of the visonaries who has only temporary access to the Divine Presence, but as an angelic servant permanently installed in the office of the *Sar ha-Panim*. The title itself is developed primarily in chs. 21–22, which are devoted to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one can find several promises coming from the mouth of archangel Gabriel and the deity himself that the translated patriarch will now stand in front God's face forever.[68]

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems to be connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,[69] which was crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature.[70]

---

[66] Although the imagery of angels of the Presence was widespread in the pseudepigraphical writings and specifically in the early Enochic pseudepigrapha, it was never explicitly identified with the seventh antediluvian patriarch. *1 En.* 40:9, however, mentions the four "Faces" or "Presences" of Ezek. 1:6 identifying them with the four principal angels: Michael, Phanuel, Raphael, and Gabriel.

[67] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 55.

[68] Cf. *2 En.* 21:3: "And the Lord send one of his glorious ones, the archangel Gabriel. And he said to me 'Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever.'" *2 En.* 22:6: "And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out: 'Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!'" *2 En.* 36:3: "Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever" (Andersen, "2 Enoch," 136, 138, 161).

[69] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

[70] On the debates about the various stages in the development of the Merkabah tradition, see Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," 173–

According to the legend of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch "was raised to the rank of first of the angels and **שר הפנים** (literally, 'Prince of the Divine Face,' or 'Divine Presence')."[71] *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of Hekhalot tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

Youth

It has been already shown that in the descriptions related to Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties he often appears under the title "Youth." Such persistence of the Hekhalot writers who repeatedly connect this designation with Metatron's priestly and liturgical service may be explained by one of the possible meanings of the Hebrew term **נער**, which also can be translated as "servant." It should be stressed that the sobriquet "Youth" is never applied to designate the seventh patriarch in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the *Book of Giants*. Yet, it is significant that in some manuscripts of *Slavonic Enoch* for the first time in the Enochic tradition the seventh antediluvian patriarch becomes associated with this prominent Metatron's title.[72] Despite the fact that

---

180; David J. Halperin, "A New Edition of the Hekhalot Literature," *JAOS* 104.3 (1984) 543–552; *idem*, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*, 359–363; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 106–114; *idem*, "The Experience of the Visionary and the Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6–11 and the Apocalypse of Paul," *Semeia* 36 (1986) 97–111; *idem*, "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 123–137 (126–128); Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 67, 98–123; Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis*, 128–146; Peter Schäfer, "Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Edition und Analyse der Merkava Rabba," *FJB* 5 (1977), 65–99; *idem*, "Die Beschwöerung des sar ha-panim, Kritische Edition und Übersetzung," *FJB* 6 (1978) 107–145; *idem*, "Aufbau und redaktionelle Identität der Hekhalot Zutarti," *JJS* 33 (1982) 569–582; idem, "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 172–181; *idem*, "Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur," in *idem*, *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ, 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988), 250–276 (258, 264–265); *idem*, "The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism: Gershom Scholem Reconsidered," 277–295 in the same volume; *idem*, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 150–155; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 43–44; Michael D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 29, 153–157; 170–172; 210–212; Ephraim E. Urbach, "The Traditions about Merkavah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period," in E.E. Urbach, R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and Ch. Wirszubski (eds.), *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), 1–28 (Hebrew).

[71] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

[72] Slav. **юношѣ**.

this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation, Francis Andersen, considered this reading as the original.[73] He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's designation as "Youth" in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhalot writings.[74] In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in *OTP*, Andersen wrote:

> The remarkable reading *yunoše* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enoše* [Enoch] might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.[75]

The employment of the designation "Youth" in the Slavonic apocalypse cannot be separated from its future usage in the later Merkabah materials, since the context of the usage of the sobriquet is very similar in both traditions. Thus, according to the Merkabah tradition, God likes to address Enoch-Metatron as "Youth." In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron, "What is your name?" Metatron answers, "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world … however, my King calls me 'Youth.'"[76] The designation of the translated patriarch as "Youth" seems to signify here a special relationship between the deity and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in ch. 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

> And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me "Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me and not even to angels have I explained my secrets…as I am making them known to you today…"[77]

---

[73] Professor Francis Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as "powerful evidence."

[74] See, for example, §§384, 385, 390, 396 in Schäfer, *Synopse*, 162–163, 164–165, 166–167.

[75] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 118–119.

[76] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 257.

[77] Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature," 90–91; Andersen, "2 Enoch," 119.

It is significant that the title "Youth" here is tied to the motif of Enoch's superiority over angels and his leading role in the celestial community which will play later a prominent role in the Merkabah liturgical accounts. It is possible that the title "Youth" also signifies here Enoch's role as a very special servant of the deity who has immediate access to God's Presence which is even closer than that of the archangels. In this context it is not surprising that in the shorter recension of *2 En.* 24.1–2 the patriarch is depicted as the one who has the seat left[78] of the Lord, "closer than Gabriel," that is, next to God.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of "Youth" in the materials associated with *Slavonic Enoch* can be found in the Vienna Codex.[79] In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as "Youth"[80] in the context of angelic veneration. The passage from *2 Enoch* 22 of the Vienna Codex reads:

> And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth![81] Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's *archistratig*, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: "Let Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever." And the glorious ones bowed down and said: "Let him come up!"[82]

This veneration of the Youth by the heavenly hosts in the context of God's speech recalls the liturgical accounts found in *Synopse* 390 and *Sefer Haqqomah* where the angelic hosts prostrate themselves before the Youth in the Presence of the deity allowing the exalted angel to insert the fire of deafness into their ears. It is not coincidental that scholars previously pointed to the liturgical coloring of this scene from *2 Enoch* 22 where the patriarch changes his earthly garments for the luminous attire which now closely resembles the priestly vesture.[83]

---

[78] The assigning of the left side to the vice-regent might be seen as puzzling. Martin Hengel, however, rightly observes that this situation can be explained as the correction of the Christian scribe(s), who "reserved this place for Christ" (M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* [Edinburg: T.&T. Clark, 1995], 193). Hengel points to a similar situation in the *Ascension of Isaiah* where the angel of the holy spirit is placed at the left hand of God.

[79] I want to express my deep gratitude to Professor Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

[80] Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of "Youth" in this important manuscript. See F. Repp, "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek," *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1963), 58–68 (65).

[81] Slav. **юноше.**

[82] MS V (VL 125), [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

[83] Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 40.

Conclusion

The liturgical tradition found in *2 Enoch* can be viewed as a bridge that connects the early traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the patriarch found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* with the later Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* lore where references to the translated hero's priestly role are juxtaposed with his liturgical performances. Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.[84] For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, the "Prince of the Presence."[85] The attestation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch as the celestial liturgical director in *2 Enoch* gives additional weight to this hypothesis about the transitional nature of the Slavonic account which guides the old pseudepigraphical traditions into the new mystical dimension. In this respect the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 18 might represent an important step towards defining and shaping Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office in its transition to his new role as the celestial choirmaster.[86] It is also significant that the beginning of Enoch's liturgical functions in *2 Enoch* is conflated there with the development of his new titles-offices as the Youth and the Servant of the Divine Presence which will later play a prominent role in the Merkabah passages pertaining to Metatron's liturgical actions.

---

[84] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 102–104; Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 52–63.

[85] P. Alexander observes that "the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13" (Alexander, "3 Enoch," 248).

[86] It is intriguing that a similar or maybe even competing development can be detected in the early lore about Yahoel. Thus, *Apoc. Abr.* 10:9 depicts Yahoel as the one who is responsible for teaching "those who carry the song through the medium of man's night of the seventh hour" (R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," in *OTP*, 1.694). In ch. 12 of the same text Abraham addresses to Yahoel as "Singer of the Eternal One."

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME "METATRON" AND THE TEXT OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[1]

The history of scholarship on *2 Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* has produced no real consensus concerning the possible provenience of this apocalypse.[2] Rather, there are numerous scholarly positions.[3] These

---

[1] This study has benefited considerably from the comments and kindnesses of the following scholars who read the MS and preliminary materials at various stages: Christfried Böttrich, James Charlesworth, John Collins, April De Conick, Ian Fair, Everett Ferguson, Daniel Matt, André Resner, E.P. Sanders, Alan Segal, Carolyn Thompson, James Thompson, James VanderKam, Ben Zion Wacholder.

[2] F.I. Andersen in his English translation of *2 Enoch* notes that "there must be something very peculiar about a work when one scholar concludes that it was written by a hellenized Jew in Alexandria in the first century BCE while another argues that it was written by a Christian monk in Byzantium in the ninth century CE." See F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *OTP*, 1.95.

[3] See Andersen, "2 Enoch"; F. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ, 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); *idem*, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992); C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914); R.H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 163; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976); J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203; J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964); J. Fossum, "Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; K. Lake, "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398; M. McNamara, *Intertestamental Literature* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983); N.A. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963) 130–147; *idem*, "K istorii teksta slavjanskoj knigi Enoha (Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v vizantijskoj i staroslavjanskoj literature)," *Vizantijskij vremennik* 24 (1964) 91–108; *idem*, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72–78; J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch in Recent Research," *RSR* 7 (1981) 210–217; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969); S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and J. Jouco Bleeker (eds.), *Types of*

conclusions are most likely the consequences of the different backgrounds and perspectives which scholars have brought to their study of *2 Enoch*.

One of the important insights of research on *2 Enoch* is the view that the text has deep connections with so-called Merkabah mysticism.[4] Among the leading pioneers of this approach stand Gershom

---

Redemption (SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87; H.H. Rowley (ed.), *A Companion to the Bible* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963); A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); M.E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2.406–408; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); H. Wicks, *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1971).

[4] The term "Merkabah" is closely connected with the term which designates the mystical interpretation ("*Ma'ase Merkabah*"—"The Account of the Chariot" or "The Works of the Divine Chariot") of the first chapter of Ezekiel. Earliest traces of the Merkabah tradition are situated in apocalyptic and Qumran literature. However, as Gruenwald notes, the main corpus of the Merkabah literature was composed in Israel in the period 200–700 CE. Some references to this tradition can be found also in the literature of German Hasidim (twelfth to thirteenth centuries CE) and medieval Kabbalistic writings (the *Zohar*).

The term "Hekhalot" ("Divine Palaces") designates the corpus of literature that first gives a full-scale presentation of Merkabah mysticism (the beginning of the tradition is connected with the circle of Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai and his pupils). According to Gruenwald the main subjects dealt with in the Hekhaloth literature are heavenly ascensions and the revelation of cosmological secrets. I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGAJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980). The term "Merkabah" (the "Chariot") can be used also in its technical Kabbalistic meaning as the link between the physical and the divine worlds or as one of the upper worlds. On the Merkabah and the Hekhaloth traditions, see the following sources: D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (2 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (SJ, 11; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); I. Gruenwald and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24–25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (TTPS, 11; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); *idem*, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken

Scholem and Hugo Odeberg.[5] Odeberg may well be the first scholar who pointed out that the descriptions of celestial titles for Enoch in *2 Enoch* are the most important evidences of possible connections between the apocalypse and the texts of the Merkabah tradition.

In these descriptions of celestial titles, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, quite distinct from early Enoch literature, which was later developed in Merkabah mysticism—the image of the angel Metatron, "The Prince of the Presence." The Slavonic text provides rudimentary descriptions of several traditional Merkabah titles of Enoch-Metatron, (e.g., "the Lad," "the Scribe," "the Prince of the World," "the Prince of the Presence").[6] Keeping these manifestations of Merkabah symbolism in mind, this study will focus upon only one of these titles of Enoch, namely, "The Prince or the Governor of the World." The article will also explore some Slavonic terminology related to this title which may yield insight into the origin of the name "Metatron."

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as the "governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth."[7] *Sefer Hekhalot* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World, the leader of 72 princes of the kingdom of the world, who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One. Chapter 43 of the short recension of *2 Enoch* and a similar passage of the text of *2 Enoch* in the Slavonic collection "The Just Balance"[8] reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. Both texts outline Enoch's instructions to his children, during his brief return to the earth, in which he mentions his new role as the Governor or the Guide of the earth:

> And behold my children, I am the Governor of the earth, *p(r)ometaya* [п(р)ометаıа], I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every

---

Books, 1954); M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (TSAJ, 28; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

[5] H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); *idem, Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

[6] See A. Orlov, *"Merkabah Stratum" of the Short Recention of 2 Enoch* (M.A. Thesis; Abilene: Abilene Christian University, 1995).

[7] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 81.

[8] "The Just Balance" (*Merilo Pravednoe*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was made public. See M.N. Tichomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

> seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured.[9]

An important aspect of both passages is the Slavonic term **п(р)ометаıа** (*prometaya*), which follows Enoch's title, "The Governor of the World."[10] This term was deliberately left in its original Slavonic form in order to preserve its authentic phonetic image. *Prometaya* represents an etymological enigma for experts in Slavonic, since it is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. It should be stressed again that there is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented.

The prominent Russian linguist I. Sreznevskij, in his Slavonic dictionary, which is still considered by scholars as a primary tool of Slavonic etymology, was unable to provide a definition for *prometaya*.[11] He simply put a question mark in the space for the meaning for the word.[12] The variety of readings for this term in the manuscripts of *2 Enoch*[13] shows similar "linguistic embarrassment" among Slavic scribes who most likely had some difficulties discerning the meaning of this ambiguous term. The readings of other manuscripts include *promitaya*, *prometaemaa*, *pometaya*, *pametaa*.

One possible explanation for the singular occurrence of *prometaya* is that the word may actually be a Greek term that was left untranslated in the original text for some unknown reason. In fact, *2 Enoch* contains a number of transliterated Hebrew and Greek words preserved in their original phonetic form (e.g., *Grigori, Ophanim, Raqia Araboth)*. But if we investigate the term *prometaya* more closely, the root *meta* draws our attention nesessitating further examination of the relationship between the words *prometaya* and *metatron*.

Contemporary scholarship does not furnish a consensus concerning the origin of the name "Metatron." In scholarly literature, there are several independent hypotheses about the provenance of the term.

---

[9] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217–219.

[10] Andersen translates the title as "the manager of the arrangements on earth." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217.

[11] On the other hand, Vaillant in his edition states that *prometaya* could be identified as a rare verb corresponding to the Greek βασανίζων. The linguistic source of this suggestion remains unknown. Andersen criticizes this translation, pointing out that the meaning is not quite suitable and does not correspond to earlier materials. See Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217.

[12] "**промитати**, **промиıаıа** (*promitati, promitaja*)—?" I.I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (Moscow: Kniga, 1989), 2.1544.

[13] Andersen stresses that the variations show "theological embarassment" among the Slavic scribes ("2 Enoch," 217).

I want to draw our attention to one possible interpretation, which could be connected with some materials in *2 Enoch*. According to this interpretation, the name "Metatron" may be derived from the Greek word μέτρον (measure, rule). Adolf Jellinek may well be the first scholar who suggested μέτρον as an alternative explanation of Metatron, on the assumption that Metatron was identical with Horos.[14] Gedaliahu Stroumsa in his article, "Forms of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," gives some convincing new reasons for the acceptance of this etymology, on the basis that Metatron not only carried God's name, but also measured Him; he was His *Shi'ur Qomah* (the measurement of the Divine Body).[15] In light of this observation, Stroumsa stresses that "renewed attention should be given to μέτρον and/or *metator* as a possible etymology of Metatron."[16]

Matthew Black, in his short article devoted to the origin of the name Metatron, expounds upon an additional etymological facet of this interpretation of the name. He traces the origin of the name to a previously unnoticed piece of evidence which can be found in Philo's[17] *Quaest. in Gen.*, where, among other titles of the Logos, Black finds the term *praemetitor*.[18] He further suggests that *praemetitor* could be traced to the Greek term μετρητής,[19] the Greek equivalent of the Latin *metator*, "measurer," applied to the Logos.[20]

The term *praemetitor* in its hypothetical meaning as a "measurer" is an important piece of evidence because it is almost phonetically identical with the Slavonic term *prometaya*.

Additionally, the term *prometaya* is incorporated into the passage which describes Enoch as the Measurer of the Lord. In ch. 43 of *2 Enoch*, immediately after the use of this term, Enoch makes the following statement:

---

[14] Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 134.

[15] G.G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 287.

[16] Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God," 287.

[17] The idea that the Metatron figure originally came into Judaism from Philo's Logos speculations was popular in German scholarship of the 19th century. Cf. M. Friedländer, *Der vorchristliche Jüdische Gnostizismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898); M. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach-und Sagenkunde* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1901); M. Sachs, *Beiträge zur Sprach-und Alterthumsforschung* (Berlin, 1852); N. Weinstein, *Zur Genesis der Agada* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901).

[18] M. Black, "The Origin of the Name Metatron," *VT* 1 (1951) 218.

[19] Black, "The Origin of the Name Metatron," 218.

[20] Black, "The Origin of the Name Metatron," 218.

> I have arranged the whole year. And from the year I calculated the months, and from the months I calculated the days, and from the day I calculated the hours. I have measured[21] and noted the hours. And I have distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure[22] and every righteous scale. I have measured[23] and recorded them.[24]

A similar passage in the previously mentioned collection, "The Just Balance" also emphasizes the functions of Enoch as the measurer:

> And the whole year I combined, and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded. And in everything I discovered differences.[25]

These two passages echo the passage from Philo's *Quaest. in Gen.* which discusses the Divine Logos as the "just measure":

> And "Gomorra," "measure" true and just is the Divine Logos, by which have been measured and are measured all things that are on earth—principles, numbers and proportions in harmony and consonance being included, through which the form and measures of existing things are seen.[26]

The text of *2 Enoch* uses the identical term "just measure" (**мѣра правєдна**), immediately after the passage dedicated to the function of Enoch as a measurer.

In addition to Stroumsa's suggestion about possible connections between "the measurer" and "the measurement of divine body," it is noteworthy that there is another hypothetical link between the functions of Enoch-Metatron as "the measurer" and his "measurement" of human sin for final judgement in the text of *2 Enoch*. Following Enoch's introduction as "the measurer," the text mentioned the "measurement" of each person for final judgment:

> …in the great judgement day every measure and weight in the market will be exposed, and each one will recognize his own measure, and in it he will receive his reward… Before humankind existed, a place of

[21] **измѣриⷯ.**
[22] **мѣрꙋ.**
[23] **измѣриⷯ.**
[24] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 171.
[25] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217.
[26] Philo, *Quaest. in Gen.* 4.23.

> judgment, ahead of time, was prepared for them, and scales and weights by means of which a person will be tested.[27]

A second possible interpretation of the term *prometaya* can be traced to Enoch's title, "Governor of the World," after which the Slavonic term *prometaya* occurs. It can be assumed that *prometaya* in this situation is a Greek word, which is somehow connected with this title. Possible hypothetical Greek prototypes of *prometaya* could be προμήθεια (προμηθεύς, προμηθέομαι), in the sense of protection, care, or providence, which could be directly related to the preceding title of Enoch—the Governor, or the Guide of the earth—"I am the Governor of the earth, *prometaya*, I have written them down."

In conclusion, it is important to note that *prometaya* could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the title that later was transformed into the term "metatron." In relation to this, Gershom Scholem, in his analysis of the term "metatron," shows that the reduplication of the letter *tet* (ט) and the ending *ron* represent a typical pattern that runs through all Merkabah texts. In his opinion, "both the ending and the repetition of the consonant are observable, for instance, in names like Zohariel and Adiriron."[28] Further, he stresses that it must also be borne in mind that *on* and *ron* may have been fixed and typical constituents of secret names rather than meaningful syllables.[29]

Thus, keeping in mind the possible date of *2 Enoch* in the first century of the common era before the destruction of the Second Temple, *prometaya* could be one of the earliest traces connecting the names Enoch and Metatron.[30]

---

[27] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 219.

[28] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 69.

[29] Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 69–70.

[30] On the hypothetical date of *2 Enoch* see: Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965), 17; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 50.

RESURRECTION OF ADAM'S BODY: THE REDEEMING ROLE OF ENOCH-METATRON IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[1]

In *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse written in the first century CE, a hint about the angelic status of its hero is expressed through his refusal to participate in a family meal. Chapter 56 of this work depicts Methuselah inviting his father Enoch to share food with the close family. In response to this offer the patriarch, who has recently returned from a long celestial journey, politely declines the invitation of his son offering him the following reasons:

> Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and earthly pleasure my soul does not remember, nor do I desire anything earthly.[2]

The important feature of this passage from the Slavonic apocalypse is the theme of the "ointment of glory," a luminous substance which transformed the former family man into a celestial creature who is no longer able to enjoy earthly food. This motif of transforming ointment is not confined solely to chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* but plays a prominent part in the overall theology of the text. The importance of this motif can be illustrated by its significance in the central event of the story, the hero's radiant metamorphosis in the front of God's *Kavod*. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays the archangel Michael anointing Enoch with delightful oil, the ointment of glory identical to that mentioned in chapter 56. The text tells us that the oil's appearance in this procedure was "greater than the greatest light and its ointment is like sweet dew, and it is like rays of the glittering sun."[3]

---

[1] This paper was presented in 2003 to the Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism Group at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.

[2] *2 Enoch* 56:2, the longer recension. F.A. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.182.

[3] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.138.

One can see that in the Slavonic text the oil of mercy, also known in Adamic traditions as the oil of resurrection, is responsible for the change of Enoch's mortal nature into the glorious state of a celestial being. It is also significant that the oil appears here to be synonymous with the Glory of the Deity since the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 56 describes the oil as the "ointment of the Lord's glory." In this respect it should not be forgotten that Enoch's embrocation with shining oil takes place in front the Lord's glorious extent, labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Divine Face. The patriarch's anointing therefore can be seen as covering with Glory coming from the Divine *Kavod*.

At this point it must be noted that several manuscripts of the shorter recension bring some problematic discrepancies to this seamless array of theological motifs pertaining to the patriarch's anointing. They insist that the patriarch was anointed not with ointment of the Lord's glory but instead with the ointment coming from Enoch's head. Thus two manuscripts of the shorter recension (*A* and *U*) insist that the patriarch was anointed not with ointment of *the Lord's glory* but instead with the ointment coming from Enoch's head.

The passage from chapter 56 attested in the manuscripts *A* and *U* reads: "Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my [Enoch's] head (ѥлѣемь главы моѥѧ)… ."[4]

This tradition which describes the miraculous power of the oil coming from the head of the main character of the text appears to be quite puzzling. Yet in the light of the later Jewish materials this motif about the transforming substance coming from the head of the celestial creature might not be entirely incomprehensible. For example, in *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 34 one learns that the reviving dew, a rabbinic metaphor for the oil of the resurrection, will come at the eschatological time from the head of the Deity:

> Rabbi Tanchum said: On account of the seed of the earth, when it is commanded, (it) discharges the dew for the resurrection of the dead. From what place does it descend? From the head of the Holy One; for the head of the Holy One, is full of the reviving dew. In the future life the Holy One, will shake His head and cause the quickening dew to descend,

[4] M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 123.

> as it is said, "I was asleep, but my heart waked … for my head is filled with dew, my locks with the drops of the night" (Song of Songs 5.2).[5]

In another prominent compendium of Jewish mystical traditions this motif about the dew of resurrection coming from the head of God is repeated again. The *Zohar* 1:130b–131a reads:

> And at the time when the Holy One will raise the dead to life He will cause dew to descend upon them from His head. By means of that dew all will rise from the dust… . For the tree of life emanates life unceasingly into the universe.[6]

Both passages about the reviving dew, as well as the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 22, might have their earlier background in Psalm 133:2–3 where the precious oil running down on the head (**כשמן הטוב על הראש ירד**) of Aaron is compared with the dew of the eternal life sent by the Deity. Yet *2 Enoch's* accounts about the oil of anointing appear to emphasize not only the priestly but also the eschatological role of the translated patriarch who is predestined to play an important part in redemption of humanity from the sin of the Protoplast.

The question remains, however, how the traditions about the dew of resurrection coming from the Deity's head are related to the problematic readings postulating that the resurrection oil is coming not from the head of the Lord but instead from the head of Enoch. The confusion between the head of the seer and the Deity's head, God's oil and the oil of Enoch, the glory of the Lord and the glory of the exalted patriarch reflected in Slavonic text, does not appear to be coincidental. It seems to reflect a significant theological tendency of the text where Enoch's heavenly "persona" is understood as the "replica" of the Divine *Kavod*, in front of which the visionary was recreated as a heavenly being. The similarities between the two celestial corporealities—The Divine *Kavod* and the newly acquired celestial extent of Enoch-Metatron, which in some traditions serves as the measurement of the divine body—have been previously explored in several important studies. This presentation however seeks to address another eschatological dimension in which Enoch's new identity is connected with his new role as the redeemer of humanity who is able to reverse the sin of Adam. Before proceeding to

---

[5] *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (tr. G. Friedländer; New York: Hermon, 1965), 260.

[6] H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933), 2.21.

the analysis of this theme in the Slavonic text and its connection with the Adamic tradition, a short excursus into the later Hekhalot materials is necessary.

Scholars have previously noted that in the additional chapters of *Sefer Hekhalot* Metatron appears to be viewed as a pre-existent being, first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascends to the protoplast's heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe.[7] *3 Enoch* 48C:1 (§72 of Schäfer's edition) reads: "The Holy One, blessed be he, said: I made him strong, I took him, I appointed him, namely Metatron my servant (**עבדי**), who is unique among all the denizens of the heights… . 'I made him strong' in the generation of the first man (**בדורו של אדם הראשון**)… ."[8]

Scholars have noted that "Enoch here becomes a redeemer figure—a second Adam through whom humanity is restored."[9] This understanding of Enoch-Metatron as the Redeemer does not appear to be a later invention of the rabbinic and Hekhalot authors but can be already detected in *2 Slavonic Enoch*.

In chapter 64 of the Slavonic text an "astounding account" can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, "could hardly please a Jew or a Christian." The chapter depicts a prostration of "the elders of the people" and "all the community" before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

> O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your sons, and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face of the Lord for eternity, because you are the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people upon the earth; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and the one who carried away the sin of humankind (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).[10]

---

[7] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 102–104; M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron" *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.

[8] P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.311; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 36–37.

[9] Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," 111.

[10] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as "the one who carried away the sin of humankind." This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer is intriguing. But what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away? Can it be merely related to Enoch's role as an intercessor for humans at the time of the final judgment? In this respect it is important that in *2 Enoch* 64 the "elders of the earth" define Enoch, not as the one who will carry away the sin of humankind, but as the one who has already carried away this sin. The emphasis on the already accomplished redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual sins of Enoch's descendents but on the primeval sin of humankind. Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children, the fallen angels or the "elders of the earth." Rather they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able to "carry away" by his righteousness, ascension, and transformation. Yet Enoch's role in the economy of human salvation is not confined solely to his past encounter of the Face of God. In the Slavonic apocalypse he himself becomes a redeemer who is able to cause the transformation of human subjects. The significant detail of the aforementioned account in chapter 64 that unfolds Enoch's redeeming functions is that the same people who proclaim the patriarch as the redeemer of humanity now also find themselves prostrated before Enoch asking for his blessing so that they may be glorified in front of his face. *2 Enoch* 64 tells:

> And the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch. And they said to him, "O our father, Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your sons, and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today."[11]

This depiction recalls the earlier scene of the patriarch's approach to the *Kavod* in *2 Enoch* 22 where the visionary is depicted as prostrated before the Divine Face during his account of transformation. The only difference here is that instead of the Divine Face people are now approaching the Face of Enoch. It is intriguing that the shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 64 seems to attempt to portray the translated

[11] *2 Enoch* 64:4 (the longer recension). Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.190.

patriarch as a sort of replica or an icon of the Divine Face through which humans can access the Divine *Panim* and become glorified:

> And they kissed Enoch, saying, "Blessed is the Lord, the eternal king. Bless now your people, and glorify us to the face of the Lord. For the Lord has chosen you, to appoint you to be the one who reveals, who carries away our sins."[12]

In light of these theological developments taking place in the Slavonic apocalypse where the patriarch assumes the role of redeemer whose face is able to glorify human subjects, it is not coincidental that some manuscripts of *2 Enoch* confuse the glory of the Deity with the glory of the patriarch and the oil of the Lord with the oil of Enoch's head. These readings therefore appear to be not simply scribal slips but deliberate theological reworking in which Enoch's oil might be understood as having the same redeeming and transformative value as the oil of the Lord.

[12] *2 Enoch* 64:3–4 (the shorter recension). Andersen, "2 Enoch," 1.191.

THE ADAM TRADITION

ON THE POLEMICAL NATURE OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*: A REPLY TO C. BÖTTRICH

In one of the recent issues of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*[1] Christfried Böttrich offered his criticism[2] of my article[3] dedicated to the polemical developments in the shorter recension of the Melchizedek legend of *2 Enoch*.

In his critical response C. Böttrich denied the possibility of any polemics not only in the Melchizedek story but also in the whole text of the Slavonic apocalypse. He stated that "polemics are not heard elsewhere in the narration; the picture of a still unified archaic mankind has no place for them."[4]

Böttrich's strong negative reaction to the possibility of polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse must be understood in the context of his own scholarship. If such polemical developments do indeed exist, they pose

---

[1] C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.

[2] All Böttrich's criticism rests on his single erroneous assumption that *2 Enoch* 71:32–33, which I used in my argument, represents an interpolation. This assumption is simply incorrect. There is nothing Christian in these two verses. They are presented in both recensions in all major MSS of *2 Enoch*. A simple comparison of two recensions provides additional proof that it is not an interpolation. In the shorter recension an interpolation in 71:34–36 is absent. If 71:32–33 also belongs to this interpolation it is difficult to explain why these verses are still preserved in the shorter recension. It should be noted that previous translators A. Vaillant and F. Andersen did not consider *2 Enoch* 71:31–32 as an interpolation. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952), 80–82; F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.208 note p. It is unfortunate that Böttrich did not read my other article on the same subject (A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273) where I further develop my argument about the polemical nature of the Melchizedek story of *2 Enoch* on the materials of the longer recension. In this article I demonstrated the important role that *2 Enoch* 71:31–32 play in the anti-Noachic polemics of the Slavonic apocalypse.

[3] A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38.

[4] C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," 465.

a serious problem to Böttrich's research on *2 Enoch*; this research has been for many years conducted without any recognition or consideration of such polemics. The existence of these polemical developments would reveal, therefore, the obvious flaw of his methodological approach, which has been unable to grasp the polemical character of the text. Moreover, if the investigation were to proceed with the proper methodology, one which takes into consideration the polemical nature of *2 Enoch*, a large number of Böttrich's conclusions on the theology, the history of the transmission, and the role of Jewish mystical traditions in the text would be dismissed as erroneous.

My reply to Christfried Böttrich, however, should not proceed solely as an exposition of the errors of his previous research, but should rather take a form of a further demonstration of the polemical nature of the Slavonic apocalypse. This chapter, therefore, will seek to investigate the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*, one of the most important polemical developments taking place in the Slavonic apocalypse; this polemical development, unfortunately, completely escaped Böttrich's attention.[5] By this investigation I will try to demonstrate that the polemics permeate the whole text and that without consideration of them any research on *2 Enoch* ends inevitably in a blind alley.

The Function of the Adamic Tradition in 2 Enoch

Adam's story occupies a prominent place in *2 Slavonic (Apocalypse of) Enoch*. The traditions pertaining to the first human can be found in all the sections of the book.[6] In these materials Adam is depicted as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a major bulk of Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, which includes, for example, the lengthy Adamic narrative in chapters 30–32, the Adamic tradition is not confined solely to this recension. A number of important Adamic passages are also attested in the shorter recension. The extensive presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and their significance for

[5] It is remarkable that Böttrich's book dedicated to the Adamic tradition in *2 Enoch* [C. Böttrich, *Adam als Microkosmos* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995)] does not have even one word on the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in the Slavonic apocalypse. The question of the influence of the Adamic tradition on the image of Enoch is also completely ignored.

[6] *2 Enoch* 30:8–32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1–3; 71:28.

the theology of the Slavonic apocalypse indicates that they are not later interpolations but are part of the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the intertestamental Enochic text is quite unusual. In the early Enochic circle, included in the composition known as *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, Adam does not figure prominently. His presence in these materials is marginal and limited to a few insignificant remarks. Besides these few short references to the first humans,[7] the early Enochic booklets are silent about the traditions associated with the protoplast. Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic apocalypse. *1 Enoch's* materials do not give any specific details about the elevated status of the protoplast. For example, the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85:3) depicts Adam as a white bull. Although white is a positive symbol in the imagery of *An. Ap.*,[8] scholars note that, in general, this allegory does not indicate goodness or elevation, but rather lineage.[9] Thus, in *An. Ap.* all the sheep are white, even the blinded ones. The white color, therefore, does not serve as a sign of the elevated or angelic status of the protoplast. Sethites, for instance, are also depicted as white bulls. If the authors or editors of *An. Ap.* want to stress the angelic status of a character, they usually depict it in transformation from an animal into a human. Thus, in Ethiopic and Aramaic versions of *An. Ap.* (*1 Enoch* 89:36), Moses is portrayed as the one who was transformed from a sheep into a man during his encounter with God on Mount Sinai. Moses' "humanization" points to his transition to angelic status. The same process can be found in the Ethiopic version of *An. Ap.* (*1 Enoch* 89:9) where Noah's angelic metamorphosis is symbolically depicted as a transformation from a white bovid into a man.[10] Such "humanization," however, was never applied to Adam in *An. Ap.*

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic circle can be explained by several factors. Scholars previously observed that Enochic and Adamic traditions often offer contending explanations of the origin of evil in the world.[11] The Enochic tradition bases its under-

---

[7] See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9–11; 85:3; 90:37–38.

[8] P. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (EJL, 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 226.

[9] Tiller, 226.

[10] The "humanization" of Noah is not attested in the Aramaic. See: Tiller, 267.

[11] M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149.

standing of the origin of evil on the Watchers story, where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

From the point of view of this long-lasting contention between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the sudden occurrence of the large bulk of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions skillfully interpolated into the original narrative during its long transmission in the Greek and Slavonic milieux.

A closer examination of the text, however, shows that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is not secondary or coincidental but has a profound conceptual value for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.[12] For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world.[13]

---

[12] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 102–104; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), 52–63.

[13] One can argue that the beginning of this process can be seen already in the *Book of the Similitudes* where Enoch seems to be identified with the Son of Man. It is possible that the *Similitudes*, written close to the time of *2 Enoch*, also reflects this process of transition to the new image of Enoch. In contrast to *2 Enoch*, the *Similitudes*, however, does not elaborate this process to the same degree as the Slavonic apocalypse does. Enoch's transformation into the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* 71 is rather instantaneous and ambiguous. In contrast, in *2 Enoch* this process of Enoch's transition to new super-angelic identity is described in detail through the expositions of Enoch's celestial titles which unfold the patriarch's new roles in numerous celestial offices. On Enoch's transformation in the *Similitudes*, see J.R. Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; SJSJ, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 9–15; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 151; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–180; D.W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS, 47; Missoula: Scholars, 1979), 14–23; J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71," *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, *et al.*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 182–183.

In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, "the Prince of the Presence."[14] It is, therefore, possible that this new profile of the elevated Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse can serve as an important clue to unriddling the mysteries of the extensive Adamic presence in *2 Enoch*.

In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article[15] in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research dealt mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrated that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory lost during the protoplast's transgression.[16]

Idel further suggested that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis attested in *2 Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observed that to the best of his knowledge, "Enoch is the only[17] living person for whom … luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made."[18]

Philip Alexander, in his recent research, provides new insight into Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic tradition

---

[14] P. Alexander observes that "the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3–13." P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols,; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.248.

[15] M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240. The original Hebrew version of this article appeared in: *Early Jewish Mysticism* (ed. J. Dan; Jerusalem, 1987).

[16] Idel points to one of such accounts, the Armenian text known as "The Words of Adam and Seth" where the following tradition can be found: "But he [Adam], not having observed the commandments, and having been stripped of the divine light, and having been thrown outside the Garden, became an equal of the dumb beast. And Enoch considered these things, and for forty days and for forty nights he did not eat at all. And after this he planted a luscious garden, and he planted in it fruit bearers and he was in the garden for five hundred and forty-two years, and after that, in body, he was taken up to heaven, and was found worthy of the divine glory and light." Michael E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets* (Jerusalem, 1982), 12–13.

[17] It should be noted that rabbinic and Samaritan literature often depict Moses as a luminous counterpart of Adam who acquired a luminous garment during his encounter with the Lord on Mount Sinai.

[18] M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," 224.

for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the "supernatural radiance" of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, later returned to be reincarnated in Enoch.[19] He further observes that

> … behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels … Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure—a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.[20]

It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between Enoch and Adam are valid and deserve further investigation. It seems that the traces of the concept of Enoch as a second Adam can be detected already in *2 Enoch* where Enoch assumes the glorious status of the protoplast.

It is also significant that in the Slavonic apocalypse the luminosity is not the only quality that Enoch inherited from Adam. In this text, Enoch acquired a whole host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. In the course of these polemical appropriations, the elevated angelic status of the prelapsarian Adam, his luminosity, his wisdom, and his special roles as the king of the earth and the steward of all earthly creatures are transferred to the new occupant of the celestial realm, the patriarch Enoch, who, near the Lord's throne, is transformed into one of the glorious ones initiated into the highest mysteries by the Lord, becomes the "manager of the arrangements on the earth," and writes down "everything that nourished" on it.

Our further analysis will demonstrate that the traditions about the prelapsarian conditions of Adam provide an initial background for the polemical appropriations. The features of Adam's story, his roles and offices, are used in *2 Enoch* as the building blocks[21] for creating the new, celestial identity of the elevated Enoch.

---

[19] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 111.

[20] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 111.

[21] It should be noted that the Adamic tradition is not the only "building material" used in *2 Enoch* in order to create the new, celestial image of Enoch. There is also a strong presence of the traditions about the elevated Moses which help to enhance Enoch's new identity in various theophanic settings throughout the text. On the Mosaic traditions in *2 Enoch* see, A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic

This investigation must now turn to the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* in order to explore in detail these polemical developments.

King of the Earth

2 Enoch 30:12 describes Adam as the king of the earth.[22] This honorable role in *2 Enoch*, as in the Genesis account, represents not merely an impressive metaphor but presupposes specific duties which demonstrate Adam's royal status. Most of these activities have biblical roots.[23] From *2 Enoch* 58:3, we learn that the Lord appointed Adam over

> …everything [as king], and he subjected everything to him in subservience under his hand, both the dumb and the deaf, to be commanded and for submission and for every servitude. So also to every human being. The Lord created mankind to be the lord of all his possessions.[24]

This description of Adam's duties corresponds to the account found in Gen 1:26–30 where God gives Adam dominion over "everything that has the breath of life."

As in Gen 2:19–20, one of the important functions of the new appointed king is the registration of all the "possessions," i.e., all the living creatures of the earth given to his stewardship through the act of their naming. *2 Enoch* 58 states that

> …the Lord came down onto the earth [on account of Adam] and he inspected all his creatures which he himself had created in the beginning of the thousand ages and then after all those he had created Adam. And the Lord summoned all the animals of the earth and all reptiles of the earth and all the birds that fly in the air, and he brought them all before

---

Tradition," *Seminar Papers 39, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2000* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 130–147; *idem*, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in: *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 2.59–76.

[22] Slav. **царь земли**. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 1.30.

[23] On the connections between the Genesis account and the Adamic story of *2 Enoch*, see: J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature," *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 3; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 34–62.

[24] Andersen, 1.184.

> the face of our father Adam, so that he might pronounce names for all the quadrupeds; and [Adam] named everything that lives on the earth.[25]

Giving names here, just as in the Genesis account, also designates Adam's dominion over "everything that lives on the earth." This dominion, however, as in the Biblical account, is supervised by the Lord. The whole picture indicates that the author of *2 Enoch* understands Adam's "kingship" as the management of God's property.[26] It is significant that the Slavonic apocalypse defines Adam's role as "the lord of all God's possessions."[27]

In the Slavonic apocalypse, however, the governing role of Adam as the lord of all God's possesions is challenged by the account of Enoch's kingship and his role as "the manager of the arrangements on the earth." This new role of Enoch vividly recalls the former royal status of the protoplast.

The first hint about Enoch's role as the governing power on earth comes from chapter 39 where Enoch relates to his children the details of his encounter with the divine anthropomorphic extent, identified in the text as the Lord's "Face." Enoch's description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord's Face and body. At the end of his description, Enoch delivers the following conclusion:

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of the earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and

---

[25] Andersen, 1.185.

[26] Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 88 "So the Creator made man after all things, as a sort of driver and pilot, to drive and steer the things on earth, and charged him with the care of animals and plants, like a *governor* subordinate to the chief and great King." *Philo* (trs. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker; 11 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949), 1.73. See, also: J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 66–68.

[27] Adam's designation as the second angel in *2 Enoch* 30:11 also seems to point to the protoplast's role as the viceroy of God. Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 148 "… and the first man was wise with a wisdom learned from and taught by Wisdom's own lips, for he was made by divine hands; he was, moreover, a king, and it befits a ruler to bestow titles on his several subordinates. And we may guess that the sovereignty with which that first man was invested was a most lofty one, seeing that God had fashioned him with the utmost care and deemed him worthy of the *second* place, making him His own viceroy and the lord of all others." *Philo* 1.117. It is also important that in *2 Enoch* the realm of Adam's dominion is designated as *another world*: "And the devil understood how I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on the earth, to rule and reign over it." *2 Enoch* 31:3. Andersen, 1.154.

> dangerous] it is stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies… Who can endure that endless misery?[28]

In the light of the overall logic of the patriarch's speech, in which the "attributes" of the Lord have been compared with Enoch's "attributes," it becomes clear that the earthly king of the story is Enoch himself. This interpretation is "confirmed" by the manuscripts of the shorter recension which directly identify Enoch as the earthly king:

> And now my children, listen to the discourses of an earthly king. It is dangerous and perilous to stand *before the face of the earthly king*,[29] terrifying [and very perilous] it is…[30]

The designation of Enoch as the royal/governing power on earth is not confined solely to the passage found in chapter 39. *2 Enoch* 46:1–2 (the longer recension) also recounts the tradition about Enoch as the earthly king. There again Enoch refers to his royal status indirectly in third person.[31]

The significant feature of Enoch's designation as the earthly king in the Slavonic apocalypse is that this text understands Enoch not as one of the earthly kings, but as *the* king of the earth who, in a manner similar to the protoplast, supervises all arrangements on the earth. This exclusive role is hinted at in *2 Enoch* 64, which depicts the patriarch's address to the *princes of the people* as they prostrate themselves before him. This role is also intimated in chapter 43 of the shorter recension and a similar passage from *2 Enoch* found in the Slavonic collection the "Just Balance" (Slav. "*Merilo Pravednoe*"), where Enoch is described as the manager of the earth:

> …and behold my children, I am the manager of the arrangements on earth, I wrote (them) down. and the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded …[32]

It should be noted that the definition of Enoch as the king is a unique motif in early Enochic materials.[33] In *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the *Book of*

---

[28] *2 Enoch* 39:8 (the longer recension). Andersen, 1.164.

[29] Slav. **пред лицем царѣ земнаго.**

[30] *2 Enoch* 39:8. Andersen, 1.165.

[31] "Listen, my people, and give heed to the utterance of my lips! If to an earthly king someone should bring some kinds of gifts, if he is thinking treachery in his heart, and the king perceives it, will he not be angry with him?" Andersen, 1.172.

[32] Andersen, 1.217.

[33] I am indebted to Professor James VanderKam for this clarification.

Giants, the patriarch is often described as an intercessor, a visionary, a scribe, an expert in secrets, but never directly as a king.[34] It, therefore, becomes apparent that the royal/governing functions of Enoch are construed in the Slavonic apocalypse in the context of its polemical response to the Adamic tradition; it serves as a counterpart to the royal status of the protoplast. It is not therefore coincidental that in this situation some duties of Adam in his office of the king of the earth become also transferred to the new occupant of this office, the seventh antediluvian patriarch. In chapters 39 and 43, Enoch's introductions as the king and the manager of the earth are followed with lengthy accounts of Enoch's activities involving measuring everything on earth. Right after Enoch is defined as the earthly king in *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch tells his children:

> …And everything that is nourished on the earth I have investigated and written down, and every seed, sown and not sown, which grows from earth, and all the garden plants, and all the grasses, and all the flowers, and their delightful fragrances and their names… I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist… .[35]

---

[34] Although Enoch's role as the governing power on earth is unknown in the early Enochic materials, it does not mean that such a designation of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse is a foreign interpolation invented by the Greek or Slavic scribes. It appears that the depiction of Enoch as the governing power on earth represents an important step in shaping the new image of Enoch as the supreme angel elevated above the angelic world. The role of Enoch as the king/manager of earth in *2 Enoch* is, therefore, directly connected with the later Metatron title, the "Prince of the World," found in the Merkabah literature and on the incantation bowls from Babylonia. Cf. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.229, 1.243; C.H. Gordon, "Aramaic and Mandaic Magical Bowls," *ArOr* 9 (1937) 94–95. The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power over the nations, kingdoms, and rulers on earth. Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* alludes to the role of Metatron as the Prince of the World, the leader of seventy-two princes of kingdoms in the world who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One … every day at the hour when the book is opened in which every deed in the world is recorded. The depiction of Metatron as the "Prince of the World" in *3 Enoch* reveals several similarities to the royal status of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse. One of them is that in *2 Enoch* 64:1 the patriarch delivers his address "to his sons and to *the princes of the people*." The reference to the princes of the people is intriguing since in *3 Enoch* 30 Metatron is described as the leader of seventy-two *princes* of the kingdoms of the world. The second important similarity is that in both texts the role of Enoch/Metatron as the governing power on earth is tied to his duties as the witness of the divine judgment. Both accounts, therefore, contain references to Enoch's writings representing the record of all the deeds of every person.

[35] Andersen, 1.164–166. In chapter 43, the same picture can be observed. Enoch's measuring activities follow his definition as the governor/manager of the earth.

It appears that the functions of Enoch in his role as the king/manager of the earth include, just as in the role of Adam, the duty registering the created order. Like Adam who "named" everything that lives on the earth Enoch in his turn writes down "every seed on the earth."[36]

It is important that Enoch's "stewardship" over the created order, akin to Adam's duties, also includes the obligation to protect and care for the animals. In *2 Enoch* 58–59, the protoplast's responsibilities pertaining to the animals are transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch and his descendants.

It is noteworthy that both accounts, the story of Adam's naming of animals and Enoch's instructions to his children about the protection of animals, are located in the same chapter of the Slavonic apocalypse. *2 Enoch* 58 depicts the Lord summoning all creatures of the earth and bringing them before Adam that the first human might name them. This story then continues with Enoch's instructions to his children about the special care for animals whose souls will testify against human beings at the great judgment if they treat them unjustly. This account, which substitutes one steward of God's earthly creatures for another, fits perfectly into the pattern of the Adamic polemics found in the Slavonic apocalypse.

In *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, C. Böttrich drew attention to the patriarch's designation as the earthly king.[37] Unfortunately, he failed to recognize the polemical meaning of this royal title in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and dismissed it as a later interpolation. Böttrich's attempt to illuminate the origins of Enoch's royal imagery through the reference to the late rabbinic text *Hayye Hanokh* from *Sefer haYashar* is problematic.[38] In light of our hypothesis about the Adamic provenance of Enoch's royal title in the Slavonic apocalypse, such dubious associations are not necessary.

---

[36] It should be noted that this role of Enoch as the measurer of *the earthly things* is unknown in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch* where Enoch's functions as the heavenly scribe are limited to the meteorological, calendarical and astronomical matters.

[37] C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992), 113–114.

[38] C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, 113. Cf. also, C. Böttrich, "Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom 'Leben Henochs'," *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996), 44–83.

Angelic Veneration

It is difficult to overestimate the value for our discussion of an article published by Michael Stone in 1993.[39] M. Stone's illuminating study reveals that the argument with the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse includes, not only the internal debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.[40] The fact that these Adamic traditions are already re-written in the Slavonic apocalypse, as the deeds and functions of the protoplast are transferred to Enoch without any reference to their original "proprietor," serves as strong evidence to the scope of the polemical intentions of *2 Enoch*'s authors.

M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21–22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. The story depicts angels bringing Enoch to the edge of the seventh heaven. By the Lord's command, the archangel Gabriel invites the patriarch to stand in front of the Lord forever. Enoch agrees and archangel Gabriel carries him to the "Face" of the Lord where the patriarch does obeisance to God. God then personally repeats the invitation to Enoch to stand before him forever. After this invitation, archangel Michael brings the patriarch to *the front* of the face of the Lord. The Lord then tells his angels, sounding them out: "Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!" In response to this address, the Lord's glorious ones do obeisance to Enoch saying, "Let Enoch yield in accordance with your word, O Lord!"[41] After that the patriarch's earthly garments were removed by archangel Michael, he was anointed with shining oil and became like one of the glorious ones.[42]

M. Stone observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21–22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.[43]

---

[39] M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.

[40] This does not mean that *2 Enoch* is literally dependent on the primary Adam books in their final form, but rather indicates that the traditions which stand behind these books have ancient origins since, by the first century CE, these traditions were already appropriated into the Enochic text.

[41] Andersen, 1.138.

[42] Andersen, 1.138.

[43] The Adamic story of the angelic veneration of Adam and Satan's disobedience is attested in many Jewish, Christian and Muslim materials. Cf. Slavonic version of *3*

These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. Archangel Michael brought the first human and had him bow down before God's face. God then commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was "younger" than ("posterior" to) Satan.

M. Stone notes that, aside from the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase "sounding them out," found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as "making a trial of them."[44] M. Stone rightly notes that the expressions "sounding them out" or "making a trial of them" imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested.[45]

Comparing the similarities between Adamic and Enochic accounts, M. Stone observes that the order of events in *2 Enoch* exactly duplicates the order found in the primary Adam books since both sources know three chief events:[46]

I. *LAE*: Adam is created and situated in heaven.
   2 Enoch: Enoch is brought to heaven.
II. *LAE*: Archangel Michael brings Adam before God's face. Adam does obeisance to God.
   2 Enoch: Archangel Michael brings Enoch before the Lord's Face. Enoch does obeisance to the Lord.
III. *LAE*: God commands the angels to bow down. All the angels do obeisance. Satan and his angels disobey.
   2 Enoch: "The rebellion in the Adam events is assumed. God tests whether this time the angels will obey. The angels are said to bow down and accept God's command."[47]

Baruch 4; *Gos. Bart.* 4, Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24; *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85.

[44] W.R. Morfill and R.H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896), 28.

[45] M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000), 47.

[46] M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48.

[47] Stone, The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48.

M. Stone concludes that the author of *2 Enoch* 21–22 was cognizant of the traditions resembling[48] those found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.[49] He also stresses that these traditions did not enter *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, because this form of tradition does not occur in the Slavonic recension of the primary Adam book.[50]

It appears that the Adamic tradition from chapter 22 is not an interpolation, but belongs to the original core of the Slavonic apocalypse. Two significant features found in *2 Enoch* seem to indicate that the tradition of angelic veneration is interwoven into the original fabric of the text. The first is evidenced in chapter 7 of the Slavonic apocalypse. *2 Enoch* 7:3 depicts Enoch carried by angels to the second heaven. There the patriarch sees the condemned angels kept as prisoners awaiting the "measureless judgment." Enoch's angelic guides explain to him that the prisoners are "those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord's commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away with their prince and with those who are under restraint in the fifth heaven."[51] The story further continues with angelic veneration: the condemned angels bow down to Enoch asking for his intercession: "Man of God, pray for us to the Lord!"[52]

It is possible that this passage about the group of the condemned angels is an allusion to the motif of angelic veneration found in *2 Enoch* 22 and in the primary Adam books.

Three details of the story from *2 Enoch* 7 seem to support this interpretation:

a. In *2 Enoch* 7, just as in the Adamic accounts, the sin of the imprisoned angels is *disobedience* to the Lord's commandments.
b. The agents of the rebellion are a *group of angels* with "*their prince*." This recalls the information found in the Adamic accounts where not only Satan, but also other angels under him, refuse to venerate

---

[48] M. Stone's argument was later supported and developed by G. Anderson. G. Anderson observes that "one cannot imagine that the tradition in the Enoch materials was created independently from the tradition found in the *Vita*." G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 101.

[49] Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48.

[50] Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance," 48.

[51] Andersen, 1.114.

[52] Andersen, 1.114.

Adam. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 18:3 directly identifies the prisoners of the second heaven as the angels of Satanail.[53]

c. The imprisoned angels *bow down* before man (Enoch). An additional important detail here is that the patriarch is addressed by the fallen angels as a "man"—"a man of God."

This act of angelic bowing before Enoch in the second heaven might anticipate later angelic obeisance the patriarch received in chapter 22 of the Slavonic apocalypse.

The second evidence demonstrating that the theme of angelic bowing from chapter 22 is deeply imbedded in the original theological framework of the Enochic writing is its connection with the Enochic title "Youth" or "Lad" found in some Slavonic MSS of *2 Enoch*.

Youth

We have already seen that the authors of *2 Enoch* are responsible for creating the new roles and titles of Enoch which are absent in the early Enochic treatises of *1 Ethiopic Enoch* but can be found in the later Merkabah mysticism. One of such titles is "Youth" which becomes one of the favorite designations of Metatron in the Merkabah literature.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the title "Youth" in the Slavonic text and its connection with the Adamic tradition, a short excursus into the later rabbinic materials is necessary.

Recently Gary Anderson demonstrated that the Adamic story of angelic veneration and opposition to humanity played a prominent role in rabbinic literature.[54] In his article Anderson draws attention

[53] *2 Enoch* 18:3 "And those men answered me, 'These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail. And similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are in the second heaven, imprisoned in great darkness.'" Andersen, 1.130. It is noteworthy that in *2 Enoch* the Enochic story of the Watchers' rebellion and the Adamic story of Satan's refusal to venerate humanity appear to be closely connected. They demonstrate an intriguing parallel to the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, *3 Enoch* 5:9–10 and the *Zohar* III.207b–208a, where the leaders of the Watchers are depicted as the forces opposing the creation and elevation of humanity.

[54] G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 83–110. On the Adamic traditions in rabbinic literature see, also: A. Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391; B. Barc, "La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois

to the account found in *3 Enoch* 4 where the Adamic motif of angelic veneration, in a manner similar to *2 Enoch* 22, was applied to Enoch-Metatron.

3 Enoch 4:1–10 depicts Rabbi Ishmael questioning his celestial guide Metatron about his name "Youth." The passage reads:

> R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron: "… you are greater than all the princes, more exalted than all the angels, more beloved than all the ministers … why, then, do they call you 'Youth' in the heavenly heights?" He answered: "Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared … the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be He, Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man![55] … And once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying "Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you. Because I am young in their company and mere youth among them in days and months and years—therefore they call me 'Youth'."[56]

Commenting on this passage, G. Anderson suggests that if "we remove those layers of the tradition that are clearly secondary … we are left with a story that is almost identical to the analog we have traced in the Adam and Eve literature and II Enoch."[57] He further notes that the acclamation of Enoch as "Youth" in *Sefer Hekhalot* is intriguing since the reason *3 Enoch* supplies for this title is deceptively simple and straightforward: "Because I am young in their company and a mere youth among them in days and months and years—therefore they call me 'Youth.'" G. Anderson proposes that the title might have Adamic origins since the explanation for the epithet "youth" recalls the reason

---

premièrs siècles après J.-C.," *RSR* 48 (1975) 173–185; J. Fossum, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis," *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols. eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996), 1.529–539; P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975); A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabinnic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 108–115.

[55] For the similar tradition see: the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, and the *Zohar* III.207b–208a.

[56] P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 1.258–259.

[57] G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 107.

for the angelic refusal to worship Adam in the *Vita* on the basis of his inferiority to them by way of his age.[58]

G. Anderson's hypothesis that the origin of the title "Youth" is connected with the appropriation of the Adamic tradition is crucial to the current investigation.

It is interesting that in some manuscripts of the Slavonic Enoch the seventh antediluvian patriarch is also often addressed as "youth."[59] Despite the fact that this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation, Francis Andersen, considered this reading as the original.[60] He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's designation as "Youth" in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhaloth writings.[61] In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in OTP, Andersen wrote:

> The remarkable reading *yunoše* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enoše* [Enoch] might explain the variant as a purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (= Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.[62]

It is notable that several important occurrences of the title "Youth" in *2 Enoch* come from the mouth of angels. Thus in chapter 9 of the shorter recension, an angelic being accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm addresses him as "youth:" "This place has been prepared, Youth, for the righteous …"[63] Later in chapter 10, one can hear the same address again: "this place, Youth, has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth … ."[64]

---

[58] G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 108.

[59] Slav. **юноше**.

[60] Professor Francis Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as "powerful evidence."

[61] See, for example, *Synopse*, §§384; 385; 390; 396. Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 162–163, 164–165, 166–167.

[62] Andersen, 1.118–119.

[63] M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature," 85.

[64] Andersen, 1.119.

These angelic addresses are consistent with the Adamic and Merkabah accounts in which angelic beings point to Adam/Enoch's young age.

According to the Merkabah tradition, God also likes to address Enoch-Metatron as "Youth." In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron "What is your name?" Metatron answers, "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world … however, my King calls me 'Youth'."[65] The designation of Enoch as "Youth" seems to signify here the special relationship between the Holy One and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in chapter 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

> And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me "Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me. and not even to angels have I explained my secrets…as I am making them known to you today…"[66]

It is significant that the title "youth" here is tied to the motif of human superiority over angels, which plays a prominent role in the primary Adam books where God orders his angels to bow down before humanity.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of "youth" in the materials associated with the Slavonic Enoch can be found in the Vienna Codex.[67] In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as "youth"[68] in the context of angelic veneration:

> And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth![69] Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's *archistratig*, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: "Let Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever." And the glorious ones bowed down and said: "Let him come up!"[70]

---

[65] Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.257.

[66] M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature," 90–91; Andersen, 1.119.

[67] I want to express my deep appreciation to Professor Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

[68] Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of "youth" in this important manuscript. See: F. Repp, "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek," *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 65.

[69] Slav. **юноше**.

[70] Ms. V (VL 125) [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

In conclusion, it should be noticed that our analysis revealed that several important readings pertaining to the Adamic polemics can be found in the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It does not follow, however, that these readings are secondary and not original. The rehabilitation of the longer recension, as well as the reaffirmation of its value in recent scholarship, should not lead to the automatic rejection of everything in the shorter recension as inauthentic and secondary. The mere subscription to one of the recensions deceptively oversimplifies the problem of asserting the original text. The task is more complicated and necessarily involves a careful investigation of the theological intentions of the authors and editors of the text. Almost three decades ago F. Andersen warned students of *2 Enoch* against jumping to simplistic and hasty conclusions. He noted that "all of the materials calls for reassessment … . In the present state of our knowledge, the genuineness of any disputed passage is difficult to judge."[71] His prudent advice still remains valuable today.

The Hunger Motif

The previous analysis demonstrated that the author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse were cognizant of the motifs and themes similar to those found in the primary Adam books. One of the prominent Adamic motifs absent in the Biblical account but present in the later extrabiblical traditions is the theme of Adam and Eve's hunger after their eviction from Eden to earth.[72]

The primary Adam books begin their stories with depicting the expulsion of the first humans from the Garden. The narrative continues with describing the hunger the first humans experienced as they found themselves on earth. It seems that the cause of their hunger was not the absence of food on earth, but the dining habits of the first humans, who were used to the celestial nourishment during their stay in Paradise. It is, therefore, significant that the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the primary Adam books emphasize the difference between the

[71] Andersen, 1.93–94.

[72] On the hunger motif in the primary Adam books, see: G. Anderson, "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," *Literature on Adam and Eve*,6ff.

two foods: the angelic food which Adam and Eve ate in the paradise and the food that lies before them on the earth.[73]

In *2 Enoch* the story of the first humans' hunger takes a new polemical form. The second part of *2 Enoch* depicts the patriarch who, just like Adam and Eve, was transported from heaven to earth. This time, however, the transition is pleasant: Enoch is not punitively expelled from heaven, like Adam, but sent by God on a short trip to instruct his children. From *2 Enoch* 56:2 we learn that during Enoch's instructions, Methuselah asks his father a blessing, so that he may prepare some food for him to eat. The patriarch answers his son in the following manner:

> Listen, child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and *earthly* pleasure my soul does not remember, nor do I desire anything earthly (*2 Enoch* 56:2 the longer recension).

In the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the patriarch's rejection of food is even more decisive:

> Listen my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food.[74]

The important detail that connects this Enochic account to the account found in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin primary Adam books is their emphasis on the fact that it is the earthly food that is unsuitable for those who just came from the celestial realm. The account found in these versions of the primary Adam books also stresses this fact. They inform that Adam and Eve "did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in the Garden." Eve's discourse found in 4:2 again emphasizes this difference between earthly and celestial food, referring to earthly food as nourishment for the beasts.[75]

These similarities suggest that the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 56:2 might represent a part of the polemics with the Adamic traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. Here Enoch is depicted as superior to Adam and Eve, who must accept the earthly food as the sign of the Fall and their permanent transition to the lower realm.

---

[73] "They arose and went about upon the earth, and they did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in [the Garden]." *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (eds. G.A. Anderson and M.E. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 3E.

[74] Andersen, 1.183.

[75] *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 5E.

It should be also noted that it is unlikely that this tradition entered *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, since the Slavonic *Vita* does not attest to the traditions about earthly and celestial food.

The Motif of the Divine Face

Our previous investigation of the motif of angelic veneration showed that one of the concentrated elaborations of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch* is found in chapter 22, which depicts the climax of Enoch's celestial trip and his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. The partiarch's transition to the new, celestial identity found in this part of the text is therefore convenient for appropriating the Adamic tradition about the luminous condition of the protoplast.

The motif of the divine Face is important to linking Enoch's glorious condition with the former luminosity of Adam. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes its place in front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as the Lord's "Face."[76] From *2 Enoch* 22 we learn that the vision of the divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endured radical changes as it became covered with the divine light. This encounter transformed Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch became like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[77] This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as "one of the glorious ones." During this transition in front of the Lord's face, Enoch's own "face" became radically altered and the patriarch acquired a new glorious "visage" which

[76] "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension). Andersen, 1.136.

[77] Andersen, 1.139.

reflected the luminosity[78] of the Lord's *Panim*.[79] The important link that connects this new condition of Enoch with the condition of the glorious Adam is the theme of the new creation after the Lord's Face. It has been shown that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch was *formed*. The new creation after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who also was "modeled" after the Face of God. Support for this view can be found in *2 Enoch* 44:1 where one learns that the protoplast was also created after the Face of God. The text says that "the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of his own face, both small and great, the Lord created [them]."[80] It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical reading attested in Gen 1:26–27 where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). F. Andersen observes that *2 Enoch's* "idea is remarkable from any point of view… This is not the original meaning of *tselem*… The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for "image."[81]

It is clear, however, that this reading did not arise in the Slavonic environment, but belonged to the original argument of *2 Enoch* where

---

[78] *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frozen," then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 "R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." *3 Enoch* 15:1. Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.267.

[79] It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's "face," just as the Lord's face acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus in *2 Enoch* 64:3–5 the following tradition can be found: "… and the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch… O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today." Andersen, 190.

[80] Andersen, 1.170.

[81] Andersen, 1.171, note b.

the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic "creation" of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in the view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

Regrettably, Böttrich did not recognize the pivotal role of the imagery of the divine Face in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and rejected the descriptions of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as later interpolations.[82] This rejection had, in my judgment, dramatic consequences for Böttrich's research and his ability to discern the theology of the text in general and the meaning of the Adamic traditions in *2 Enoch* in particular. The tradition of the Divine Face represents a nexus through which several significant polemical trajectories of the text are interwoven together. One of these trajectories is the connection between the traditions of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30:8–11 and the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition presented in *2 Enoch* 39, which depicts Enoch as the measurer of the divine body.[83] This important connection completely escaped Böttrich's attention and undermined the credibility of his later research on the cosmic body of Adam.[84]

Oil from the Tree of Life

Another Adamic motif in the story of Enoch's transformation is the luminous oil, which causes the patriarch's glorious metamorphosis. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays archangel Michael extracting Enoch from his clothes and anointing him with delightful oil. The text tells that the oil's appearance was "greater than the greatest light and its ointment is like sweet dew, and the fragrance [like] myrrh; and it is like rays of

[82] See: C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*,112–113.

[83] G. Scholem was the first to propose that the expression "the extent of the Lord" found in *2 Enoch* 39 might reflect the exact terminology found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. Cf. Scholem's lecture "The Age of *Shi'ur Qomah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen," G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965); *idem, On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York, Schocken, 1991), 29.

[84] C. Böttrich, *Adam als Microkosmos* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995).

the glittering sun."[85] The anointing with the oil causes the patriarch's transformation from the garments of skin to the luminous garment of an immortal angelic being, one of the glorious ones.

It appears that that the oil used in Enoch's anointing comes from the Tree of Life, which in *2 Enoch* 8:3–4 is depicted with a similar symbolism. *2 Enoch* 8:3–4 tells that "… the tree [of life] is indescribable for pleasantness and fine fragrance, and more beautiful than any (other) created thing that exists. And from every direction it has an appearance which is gold-looking and crimson, and with the form of fire."[86] The shorter recension also refers to a second, olive tree near the first one "flowing with oil continually."[87]

It should be noted that the oil anointing of Enoch is a unique motif in the Enochic tradition. Enoch's approach to the throne in the *Book of the Watchers* and his transformation into the Son of Man in the *Book of the Similitudes* do not involve anointing with or any usage of oil. Later "Enochic" traditions are also silent about oil. For example, the account of Metatron's transformation in *3 Enoch* does not mention any anointing with oil.

Yet while unknown in the Enochic literature, the motif of anointing with the oil from the Tree of Life looms large in the Adamic tradition. Chapter 35(9) of the primary Adam books contains the story of Adam's sickness. The patriarch finds himself in great distress and pain. Trying to find a cure, Adam sends Eve and Seth to paradise so they can bring the oil of the Tree of Life that will relieve his illness. Their mission, however, is unsuccessful. Archangel Michael refuses to give the oil to Eve and Seth, telling them that the oil will be used "when the years of the end are filled completely" for those who "be worthy of entering the Garden."[88]

There are several corresponding characteristics that can be detected in the Adamic and Enochic accounts:

1. The purpose of the anointing is similar in both traditions. Its function is the "resurrection of Adam's body"[89] e.g., the reversal of the earthly fallen condition into the incorruptible luminous state of the protoplast.

---

[85] Andersen, 1.138.
[86] Andersen, 1.114.
[87] Andersen, 1.117.
[88] *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Armenian version).
[89] *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Armenian version).

It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* 22 oil anointing transforms Enoch into a luminous angelic being. As has been already noted, it recalls the description of the protoplast in *2 Enoch* 30:11 as a glorious angelic being.

2. The subject of the anointing is also identical. In *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books, the oil is used (or will be used) for transforming the righteous ones in their transition to the angelic state in the celestial realm. In the primary Adam books, the oil is prepared for those who "be worthy of *entering the Garden*."[90] M. Stone observes that *2 Enoch* also "knows an anointing with the heavenly perfumed oil that brings about a transformation of the righteous."[91]

The same situation is also attested in *3 Baruch*, where the reward of the righteous is oil. H. Gaylord notes that this theme in *3 Baruch* has a connection with the Adamic tradition. He observes that "by his disobedience Adam lost 'the glory of God' (4:16[G]), which may have been comparable to that of angels (cf. 13:4[S]). The reward of the righteous is oil, possibly the sign of the glory of God, which the angel-guide promises to show Baruch several times in this text (6:12; 7:2; 11:2; 16:3[S]). It is hardly accidental that there are traditions that Adam sought to receive the 'oil of mercy' at the point of death, and that Enoch was transformed by the 'oil of his glory'…"[92]

3. It is important that in *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books a person in charge of oil is the archangel Michael.[93] In *2 Enoch* 22 he anoints Enoch with shining oil causing his luminous metamorphosis. In *3 Baruch* 15:1 Michael brings oil to the righteous.[94] In the primary Adam books he also seems to be in charge of oil since it is he who declines giving Seth the oil for healing Adam.

4. It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* and the primary Adam accounts refer to the *flowing* of the oil. Thus, the Georgian *LAE* 36(9):4 relates that "…

---

[90] 43(13): "The Lord said, 'I will admit them into the Garden and I will anoint them with that unction.'" *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Georgian version).

[91] M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 127.

[92] H.E. Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.658.

[93] Cf. M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 126.

[94] E.C. Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), 59.

(God) will send his angel to the Garden where the Tree of Life is, from which the oil flows out, so that he may give you a little of that oil."[95] *2 Enoch* 8:5 seems to attest to the same tradition: "and another tree is near it, an olive, flowing with oil continually." M. Stone notes that "it is striking that *2 Enoch* highlights the flowing of the oil, just like the Adam books."[96]

These similarities show that the motif of the oil from the Tree of Life in *2 Enoch* might have Adamic provenance. It is unlikely that this tradition is a later interpolation. Attested in both recensions, it plays a pivotal role in the scene of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis.

"The One Who Carried Away the Sin of Humankind"

It has been mentioned earlier that in later Jewish mysticism Metatron was viewed as a divine being first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe. P. Alexander observes that "Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure—a second Adam through whom humanity is restored."[97] It appears that this theological motif of Enoch's redeeming role is already developed in *2 Enoch*.

In chapter 64 of the longer recension of the Slavonic apocalypse, the "astounding encomium" can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, "could hardly please a Christian or a Jew."[98] The chapter depicts a prostration of "the elders of the people" and "all the community" before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

> O our father,[99] Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front

---

[95] *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 40E.

[96] M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 126.

[97] P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 111.

[98] Andersen, 1.190.

[99] The designation of Enoch as "our father" here and in *2 Enoch* 69:2, 69:5, 70:3 might have a polemical flavor. In *2 Enoch* 58:1 Adam is also designated as "our father." In *WisSol* 10:1 the title "the Father of the World" is applied to the protoplast. See

> of the face [of the Lord for eternity], because you are the one whom the Lord *chose in preference to all the people upon the earth*; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and *the one who carried away the sin of mankind* (*2 Enoch* 64:4–5).[100]

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as "the one who *carried away* the sin of [hu]mankind." This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer is intriguing. But what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away?

Böttrich argues that the description of Enoch as the one who carried away the sins of humankind reflects not the reality but only the expectation of the "elders of the people." He stresses that *2 Enoch* absolutely rejects the idea of intercession before God,[101] pointing to the passage in chapter 53 where the patriarch warns his children that he will not be able to help them on the day of judgment, since no one can help relieve another person's sin.[102]

Unfortunately, Böttrich's observations, based on a faulty methodology, miss the gist of the argument in chapter 64. Oblivious to Adamic polemics in the text, he fails to notice a crucial detail: in *2 Enoch* 64 the "elders of the earth" define Enoch not as the one who will carry away the sin of humankind, but as the one who already carried away this sin.[103] The emphasis on the already accomplished redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual sins of Enoch's descendents, but on the primeval sin of humankind.[104] Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children,

---

P.B. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSS, 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 104–105.

[100] Andersen, 1.190.

[101] C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, 194–195. C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JJS* 32.4 (2001) 457.

[102] *2 Enoch* 53:1–4. See also7:4–5, 62:2.

[103] Slav. **ѿимитель**—literally "the one who has taken away." Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.59; 1.101. The noun **ѿимитель** derives from the verb **отъимати**, **отимати** (to remove, to release) which among other meanings can be used in the expression "to release from sin." Barhudarov's dictionary relates **отимати** to the Greek ἀφαιρεῖν. S.G. Barhudarov, ed., *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vekov* (25 vols.; Moscow: Nauka, 1975ff.) 14.74–75.

[104] Another important hint that Enoch was able to take away the sin of the protoplast is that the MSS of the longer recension speak, not about many sins, but about only one sin, "the *sin* of *[hu]mankind*." In contrast, the reading of the shorter recension, which uses a plural form—"our sins," is clearly secondary.

the fallen angels or the "elders of the earth," as Böttrich suggested. Rather they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able to "carry away" by his righteousness, ascension, and transformation. Accordingly, Enoch has already accomplished his role as the "redeemer" of humanity through his luminous metamorphosis near the throne of glory.[105] Humanity has been redeemed in him, and this redemption gives hope to other righteous ones, who will later attain the paradisal condition. The significant detail that confirms Enoch's unique redeeming role is that, unlike in chapter 53 where he opposes the idea of intercession, in *2 Enoch* 64–65 he does not object to the idea that he is able to carry away the sin of humankind.

Enoch's response to the people's address, which occupies the following chapter 65, provides additional support for interpreting the sin Enoch was able to carry away as related to the transgression of the protoplast. It is not coincidental that the patriarch starts his response with paraphrasing the account of Adam's creation, telling that the Lord "constituted man in his own form, in accordance with a similarity."[106] He further relates that the Lord gave the protoplast "eyes to see, and ears to hear, and heart to think, and reason to argue."[107] Some elements of this part of the paraphrase allude to the details of the protoplast's marvelous creation found in *2 Enoch* 30:9, namely to some of his properties (seeing, hearing, reasoning) given to Adam at his creation.

Enoch concludes his reply to the people with the theme of the restoration of humanity to its prelapsarian "paradisal" condition, further indicating that the whole account revolves around the patriarch's role in the removal of Adam's sin. It is logical, therefore, that this message of hope comes from the patriarch's mouth whose humanity has already been restored to the paradisal condition. In *2 Enoch* 65:8–10 Enoch tells the people that at the end all the righteous who escaped from the Lord's great judgment "will be collected together into the great age … and they will have a great light, a great indestructible light, and paradise, great and incorruptible. For everything corruptible will pass away, and the incorruptible will come into being, and will be the shelter of the eternal residence."[108]

---

[105] The important hint to this unique role is Enoch's definition in *2 Enoch* 64 as "the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people of the earth."

[106] Andersen, 1.190.

[107] Andersen, 1.190.

[108] Andersen, 1.192.

Conclusion

The limited scope of this paper did not allow the exploration of all the facets of the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*.[109] However, some conclusions can be drawn at this stage of the research.

1. The foregoing survey testifies to the existence of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*. These polemical developments contain, not only the "internal" debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the "external" Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.

2. The analysis shows that Adamic polemics involves a rewriting of "original" Adamic motifs and themes when the details of Adam's "story" are transferred to a new "hero," the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch.

3. The analysis demonstrates that, similar to the early booklets of *1 Enoch* the attitude of the author(s) of *2 Enoch* to Adam's figure and the traditions associated with his name, reminds highly polemical. Yet, in comparison with *1 Enoch*, the Slavonic Enoch demonstrates a paradigm shift in polemical strategy. Now the competitive tradition is not silenced but is rather exposed and openly appropriated for polemics. This switch might be connected with the challenge which the intense development of the traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets posed to the "classical" profile of Enoch found in early Enochic booklets. Adamic, Mosaic, and Noachic polemics found in *2 Enoch* might represent the reaction of the Enochic tradition to these new conceptual developments. It should be noted that the traditions about the elevated Adam appear to have been widespread in the Alexandrian environment of the first century CE, the possible place and time of the composition of *2 Enoch*.

4. The investigation of Adamic polemics proves that a number of important passages associated with the early Jewish mysticism, such

[109] One of these unexplored subjects includes the connection between the tradition of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30 and the role of Enoch as the measurer of the divine body in *2 Enoch* 39.

as the motif of the Divine Face in chapters 22 and 39, the future prominent role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power on the earth, and his title "Youth," belong to the primary text, since they play a decisive role in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse. In the light of this role Böttrich's hypothesis that these themes represent later interpolations must now be dismissed as erroneous.

5. The analysis of the polemical developments in the text also reveals that the theological intentions of its authors were not to find a peaceful consensus with the non-Jewish environment in the Diaspora situation, as Böttrich proposed, but to resolve the internal problems of the Enochic tradition in its encounter with the challenges of its competitors.

"MANY LAMPS ARE LIGHTENED FROM THE ONE": PARADIGMS OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL VISION IN THE MACARIAN HOMILIES

Among mystical testimonies circulating in the Eastern Christian tradition, two portentous descriptions of transformational visions can be found.

The first account is drawn from *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE and preserved in the Eastern Christian environment in its Slavonic translation. In this text the antediluvian patriarch Enoch describes his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory:

> And Michael, the Lord's greatest archangel, lifted me up and brought me in front of the face of the Lord … And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.[1]

The second account is written a thousand years later and comes from the *Philokalia*, a collection of Eastern Christian writings compiled by Nicodemus Hagioretes, in which Pseudo-Symeon conveys preparatory instructions for acquiring the vision of the Taboric light:

> Then sit down in a quite cell, in a corner by yourself, and do what I tell you. Close the door, and withdraw your intellect from everything worthless and transient. Rest your beard on your chest, and focus your physical gaze, together with the whole of your intellect, upon the centre of your belly or your navel. Restrain the drawing-in of breath through your nostrils, so as not to breathe easily, and search inside yourself with your intellect so as to find the place of the heart, where all the powers of the soul reside. To start with, you will find there darkness and an impenetrable density. Later, when you persist and practice this

[1] *2 Enoch* 22:6–10. F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.139.

> task day and night, you will find, as though miraculously, an unceasing joy. For as soon as the intellect attains the place of the heart, at once it sees things of which it previously knew nothing. It sees the open space within the heart and it beholds itself entirely luminous and full of discrimination.[2]

It is apparent that these two descriptions belong to very different symbolic worlds. In the first one, an adept, on his celestial trip, finds himself before the glorious appearance of the Lord, accompanied by the angels who extract the visitor from his earthly garments and anoint him with delightful oil. In the second one, he is led through darkness and "an impenetrable density" on the inner journey to the depth of his heart. The majesty of the celestial environment strikingly confronts the monotonous quietness of the inner contemplation. Still, something similar is recognizable in these two accounts. In both descriptions the visionaries eventually come to the same result—they behold themselves luminescent. Both accounts also stress the totality of this metamorphosis—mystical adepts of these visions become "entirely" luminous. It is, however, observable that in the two accounts the source of the divine light is different. In the first account, it comes from outside, namely from the glorious appearance of the Lord, depicted symbolically as the angelic anointing with shining oil. The shining oil, the "covering" substance of the transformation, serves as an additional detail which stresses the outer nature of the visionary's luminous metamorphosis.

The important feature of the second account which differentiates it from the first is the "inner" nature of the luminous metamorphosis—the illumination comes from inside, from the darkness of the soul, proceeding from the open space within the heart of the visionary.

Separated by a millennium, these two accounts serve as significant markers of the long-lasting theological journey from the outer transformational vision to its inner counterpart. On this journey the towering figure of the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius, remains prominent. The purpose of this article is to explore some of his concepts which in our opinion play a formative role in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

---

[2] Pseudo-Simeon, "The Three Methods of Prayer," in: *The Philokalia* (5 vols.; tr. G.E.H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, and K. Ware; London: Faber and Faber, 1995), 4.72–73.

The Background: Transformational Vision of the Kavod

In order to clarify the differences between the two transformational visions mentioned earlier, we must return now to the initial theological contexts which lie behind these two accounts.

The origin of the *Kavod* paradigm, which is formative for the vision in the Slavonic apocalypse, can be traced to Old Testament materials where one can find various polemics for and against the anthropomorphic understanding of God.[3] Weinfeld observes that the imagery of the enthroned divine glory known to us as the Lord's *Kavod* was "crystallized" in the Priestly and Ezekielian traditions.[4]

Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation.[5] In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle.[6]

Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source[7] but derived from early sacral conceptions.[8] In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house

---

[3] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31–38; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75–85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), 1.210–220; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8; Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990), 87–590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 191–209. On later Jewish anthropomorphism see: M. Fishbane, "The 'Measures' of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in I. Gruenwald *et al.* (eds.), *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992), 53–74; Arthur Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism* (New York: KTAV, 1937).

[4] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 191.

[5] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982), 24.

[6] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191.

[7] For the roots of the theology of the priestly tabernacle see: Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 81–83.

[8] Weinfeld shows that "the notion of God sitting enthroned upon the cherubim

ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark,[9] his footstool.[10]

This motif of the enthroned Deity becomes a central image in the book of Ezekiel, whose *Kavod*[11] theology is similar[12] to the Priestly doctrine.[13] Mettinger observes that "in Ezekiel, the *Kavod*-conception proved to represent an earlier phase than that discovered in the P-materials."[14] He further stresses that the iconography of Ezekiel is closely connected with the idea of God's royal presence in his sanctuary.[15] This connection of the *Kevod YHWH* with the enthroned God can scarcely be divorced from its previously established usage in early royal contexts.[16]

Weinfeld notes that Ezekiel's persistent tendency to describe God's *Kavod* as a brilliant and radiant fire encased in a cloud is also a distinct

---

was prevalent in ancient Israel (1Sam 4:4; 2Sam 6:2; Ps. 80:2; 2Kgs 19:15)." Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 192.

[9] Mettinger stresses that "the most important aspect of the Ark in Solomon's Temple was that it served as the footstool of God." Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 87.

[10] M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30–38.

[11] The term *Kavod* (Heb. כבוד) occurs 199 times in the Old Testament (24 occurences in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 18 in the Chronicler's history, 38 in Isaiah, 19 in Ezekiel, occasionaly in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, 51 occurences in the Psalms and 16 in Proverbs). The term כבוד can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" *Kavod* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearences in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *Kavod* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "כבוד," *TDOT*, 7.22–38.

[12] It is also noteworthy that Ezekiel and the materials of the Priestly tradition, such as Gen 5:1, share similar terminology, namely the term דמות. The term דמות appears 12 times in the Book of Ezekiel where it becomes a favorite terminology for the description of various divine and angelic "appearances." It occupies a prominent place in Biblical anthropomorphic debates. Both terms כבוד and דמות are intimately connected through the notion of "hiddeness" of the Divine form/glory. Later Jewish *Sh'iur Qomah* traditions stress the aspect of the hiddeness of דמות: "His דמות is hidden from everyone, but no one's דמות is hidden from Him." M.S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983), 113. For a fuller discussion see A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 102–104.

[13] On the connections between P and Ezekiel see B. Stein, *Der Begriff "Kebod Jahweh"* (Emsdetten; Lechte, 1939), 299. See also Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 107–111.

[14] Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 116–117.

[15] Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

[16] Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

characteristic of the Priestly writings.[17] He argues that in the Priestly and Ezekielian writings the fire and cloud are inseparable elements of the apparition of God's Glory, where the cloud is the divine envelope which screens the Deity from mortal view.[18] In later Jewish and Christian traditions the radiant luminosity emitted by various celestial beings fulfills the same function, protecting against the direct vision of their true forms. In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in later apocalyptic traditions, God's "form" remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through its light.[19] This situation explains the wide use of the *Kavod* paradigm in the visions of light phenomena.

Kavod theology leads to the special type of transformational visions that can be found in various biblical and apocalyptic materials.[20] In the climactic points of these accounts, their visionaries normally "see" the extent of the divine glory, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. A classic example of such a transformational vision is the account of Moses' shining countenance in Ex 34 after his encounter with the Lord's *Kavod* on Mount Sinai. It is noteworthy that in the apocalyptic and Merkabah traditions the vision of the Lord's Glory ("the King in His beauty") increasingly become the main teleological point of the heavenly ascents.

Enoch's transformation in the Slavonic apocalypse also belongs to the *Kavod* paradigm. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis took place in the front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's "Face."[21] From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the

---

[17] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 201.

[18] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 202.

[19] De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104–105. De Conick's research investigates the relationships between God's form and God's light, showing their complexity. She argues that in some traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kavod* is revealed through its light. "The visionary can only gain access to a vision of the deity through the deity's light." De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104–105.

[20] G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13.

[21] "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can

Divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. A significant detail in this description is that Enoch is not transformed into light but covered, "clothed," with the light of God's Glory. The use of delightful oil as a covering substance emphasizes this "covering nature" of the luminous metamorphosis.

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine Face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with that of Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face in the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun…"[22] Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at his face.[23] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

In spite of the dominant role of the *Kavod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the postbiblical rabbinic[24] and patristic environments which offered new

---

give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension). Andersen, 136.

[22] Andersen, 160.

[23] Andersen, 160.

[24] It becomes especially notable in Hekhaloth mysticism, where the teleology of the mystical journeys came to be expressed in terms of descent into the Merkabah. On Merkabah and Hekhaloth mysticism, see: P. Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–180; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader* (2 vols.; New York: KTAV, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (SJ, 11; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), xi–xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980); Gruenwald, I. and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental

understandings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience.[25] Among the new notions employed for the purposes of such a paradigm shift was the prominent biblical concept of the image of God after which Adam was created.

In the Likeness of God's Image

In his book *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*[26] Gilles Quispel draws the reader's attention to an interesting tradition preserved in Homily II.12[27] of Pseudo-Macarius. From the homily we

---

Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (TTPS, 11; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, "Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition; Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JJS* 22 (1991) 1–39; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer *et al.*, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1987–1995); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); *idem*, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954); N. Séd, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49–66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (TSAJ, 28; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

[25] On the issue of the interiorization of transformational visions see: A. Golitzin, "Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159–186; Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), "Forma lui Dumnezeu şi Vederea Slavei. Reflecţii Asupra Controversei Antropomorfite Din Anul 399 D. Hr.," in: Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), *Mistagogia. Experienţa lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998), 184–267; N. Séd, "La shekinta et ses amis araméens," *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 20 (1988) 133–142.

[26] G. Quispel, *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (SNT, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 57–58.

[27] There are four Byzantine medieval collections of the Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in *Makarius/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; ed. H. Berthold, GCS; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1973). Collection II appeared in: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964). Collection III appeared in *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Simeon aus Typus III* (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961) and *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homélies propres à la Collection III* (ed.

learn that "Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance" (II.12.1).[28] Further, another important passage in the homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (II.12.8).[29] The text reveals a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created according to the image and likeness of God[30] and Adam's "very image (εἰκόνα) itself," speaking about them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about *tselem* (Heb. **צלם**) of Adam—the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.[31]

The term "image" (Gk. εἰκών) can be found in a number of significant New Testament passages. The most important of them for the purposes of the current investigation is the Pauline description of

---

V. Desprez; SC, 275; Paris: Cerf, 1980). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following Arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

[28] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 97. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964), 107–108.

[29] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 100.

[30] It is important that Genesis 1:26 stresses that Adam's **צלם** was created after God's own **צלם**, being some sort of luminous "imitation" of the glorious **צלם** of God. Some scholars even argue that "in this way, the likeness that Adam and God shared is not physicality—in the normal sense of having a body—but luminescence." David Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body," 303.

[31] For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam see: David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299–314; S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982), 11–40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 141; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), 5.97; Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195; B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938), 11.

Christ as the "image of the invisible God" in Col. 1:15, which has often been compared to the account of the creation of Adam and seen as part of Paul's Adam Christology.[32] This theological connection between Adam's creation after the image of God and Christ as the image of God has opened several possibilities for using ancient aggadic traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam in new Christian theophanic contexts. In Pauline writings we can also see peculiar terminological parallels in which the notion of image (εἰκών) becomes closely associated with important theophanic concepts, prominent in traditional *Kavod* theology, such as glory[33] (δόξα)[34] and form (μορφή).[35]

Other important theological developments in Gnostic[36] and rabbinic circles lead to a gradual "interiorization" of the *tselem* imagery. In postbiblical Jewish accounts, *tselem* is often identified with the luminous "clothing" of the human heart. Scholem's research shows that in Jewish mysticism *tselem* was also understood as a sort of "garment" of the soul,

---

[32] J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 15. Cf. also: A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie der Apostel* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922), 299; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 174–179; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 97–99.

[33] See for example 2Cor 4:4: "… the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God…"

[34] H.A.W. Meyer, J. Weiss and J. Behm understand Paul's concept of μορφή as the divine Glory (δόξα), believing that "in Pauline sense, Christ was from the beginning no other than כבוד, δόξα of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God." See R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 104–105. One of the major exponents of the hypothesis, J. Behm, in Kittel's *TDNT*, argues that the statement in Phillipians 2:6 about the form of God corresponds closely with the statement in John 17:5 about the glory which "I had with Thee before the world was." *TDNT*, 4.751.

[35] Biblical scholars argue that μορφή and εἰκών are used as interchangeable terms in the LXX and in Paul. For example, an investigation of the Old Testament's connection between terms צלם and דמות in the light of their translation in the LXX as μορφή lead scholars to believe that "μορφή in Philippians 2:6 is immediately related to the concept εἰκών, since the Semitic root word צלם can correspond to either of the two Greek words." R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 108. For the discussion of the body/image of Christ in Pauline thought see Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

[36] J. Fossum observes that in some Gnostic circles "'the shining,' 'image,' or 'likeness' of God, after which the body of the earthly man was fashioned appears as a separate entity, even some form of hypostasis." Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 16.

which "floats" over it. He observes that "this garment also becomes the soul's heavenly attire when it returns to Paradise after death."[37] This Jewish idea of the "inner" luminous *tselem* might well be already known in Christian circles, particularly in the Syriac environment.

It is also possible that Ephraem, Macarius, and some other Syrian Christian writers might have acquired the notion of the luminous human *tselem* through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, which attest to traditions about the original luminosity of Adam and Eve.[38]

It is noticeable that in the Macarian homilies and other Eastern Christian writings the notion of luminous *tselem* became gradually employed for the purposes of the internalized beatific vision. *Tselem* became utilized as a sort of theological counterpart to the classic concept of the divine *Kavod* which traditionally played a prominent role in biblical and apocalyptic visions. Sometimes both imageries were used interchangeably.

In the patristic environment the concept of the image of God gradually became a "safer" way to convey visionary experiences of the light phenomena, especially after the anthropomorphite controversy of 399 CE,[39] when antianthropomorpic polemics[40] made it increasingly difficult to employ the traditional "anthropomorphic" language of beatific

---

[37] Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1976), 264.

[38] Cf. S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982), 11–40.

[39] On the anthropomorphite controversy see: Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Graham Gould, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 549–557.

[40] On antianthropomorphic polemics see Elizabeth A. Clark, "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *Church History* 59 (1990) 145–162; Lawrence Hennessey, "A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three Senses of Incorporeality," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 373–380; John A. McGuckin, "The Changing Forms of Jesus," in Lothar Lies (ed.), *Origeniana Quarta* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, Bd. 19; Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrola-Verlag, 1987), 215–222; David L. Paulsen, "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105–116; Gedaliahu Stroumsa, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* (1983) 345–358.

visions, including the classical *Kavod* imagery.[41] By the fourth century in patristic trinitarian debates about the divine light the *Kavod* terminology was almost completely substituted by the symbolism of the divine image.

A thousand years later, in Hesychast transformational visions of the Taboric light, the concept of the image of God still continued to play a crucial theological role. It is especially noticeable in Gregory Palamas' theology of the divine image which shows amazing parallels to the concepts and imagery of Macarius. Among them is an open employment of the Adamic *Gestalt*. Palamas, following Macarius, draws heavily on ancient traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam. In *One Hundred and Fifty Texts*, he argues that "Adam, before the fall, also par-

[41] Similar antropomorphic developments are also noticiable in postbiblical Jewish mysticism, with its gradual elaboration of the צלם concept. In Jewish tradition צלם played an important role in anthropomorphic developments. It was understood not simply as an abstract likeness but had a strong "corporeal meaning." See Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 174. See also: Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1976), 251–273. Gottstein's research deals with a number of rabbinic texts that reveal this "corporeal" understanding of צלם. He argues that in some instances it is interchangeable with other Hebrew terms for the designation of "body," like the term דמות. Speaking about these corporeal meanings of צלם Gottstein notes that "… Adam's *tselem* is his luminous body. In other sources, such as the story of Hillel washing his body [*Lev.R.* 34.3], the *tselem* referred to the physical body. *Tselem* can be thus refer to various levels, or aspects, all of which bear a resemblance to the physical body. I would propose that these various levels, or various bodies, reflect one another. The physical body is a reflection of the body of light. This reflection may translate itself down to the details of circumcision. The kind of graded devolutionary process that we encountered above may be a model for two ways of talking about *tselem*. The *tselem* in its original form may be lost, but the dimmer reflection of this form is extant in the physical body, which may still be spoken of as *tselem*." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 188. Rabbinic literature gives a number of references to traditions about the luminosity of the original *tselem* of Adam. One of them can be found in *Lev. R.* 20.2. in which "Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 4. 252. Another important passage which can be found in *Gen. R.* 20.12 tells us that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" instead of "garments of skin," stressing thus that Adam has not lost completely his luminous quality even after the Fall: "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light': this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939), 1. 171.

ticipated in this divine illumination and resplendence, and because he was truly clothed in a garment of glory he was not naked, nor was he unseemly by reason of his nakedness."[42] The Syrian background of Palamas' speculation about Adam is evident.[43] Recognizing the tragic consequences which Adam's fall had for the condition of the human *tselem*,[44] he reaffirms its irrevocable value for the inner transformational vision: "Leaving aside other matters for the present, I shall simply say that perfection of the divine likeness is accomplished by means of the divine illumination that issues from God."[45]

The theme of regaining this lost luminous image of God, "the dimmer reflection," which is still mysteriously extant in the human physical body (sometimes in the form of a luminous "clothing" of the heart) and can be eventually "restored," had a number of interesting theological ramifications in the Hesychast tradition.[46] The Hesychast idea of the light-like (φωτοειδές) sensitive nature of man[47] shows clear similarities with this early Syrian understanding of the luminous *tselem* as a reflection of God's Glory.

Internalization of the Kavod

It was mentioned earlier that in some biblical accounts the figure of Moses is often connected with the *Kavod* theology.[48] This tendency is traceable both in the Old Testament Exodus stories and in the New Testament accounts of Christ's Transfiguration where Moses serves as a

---

[42] *The Philokalia*, 4.377.

[43] An aggadic tradition, which survived in the Syrian environment, explains why Adam and Eve discovered their nakedness only after the Fall. According to the tradition, it happened because after their transgression they lost their original radiance—the "garments of light" which prevented them from seeing their naked "physical" bodies. Luminosity thus served for the prelapsarian humankind as a sort of screen which concealed their original form. Gregory Palamas clearly employs this tradition.

[44] "Even though we still bear God's image to a greater degree than the angels, yet as regards the likeness of God we fall far short of them." *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[45] *Philokalia*, 4.376.

[46] Cf. John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960–1961) 186–205 and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963–1964) 225–270.

[47] See John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963–1964) 235.

[48] On Moses' connection with the *Kavod* theology see: A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *SBLSP* 39 (2000), 130–147.

significant "theophanic" reminder. In postbiblical Jewish and Christian writings the Moses *Gestalt*, however, gradually became utilized for the purposes of internalized visions. It cannot be a coincidence that in these new theological "developments," the Moses account was also linked with the *tselem* imagery.

These tendencies are noticeable in the Macarian Homilies where Moses is often portrayed as Adam's luminous counterpart. Following the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius gives us Moses' example who "had a glory shining on his countenance." The homily refers to Moses' Sinai experience, expanding this tradition and adding some new significant details:

> Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food (II.12.14).[49]

It is noticeable that the passage serves as a bridge between the symbolic worlds of the *Kavod* and *tselem*. Macarius openly "internalizes" the Moses account, stressing that Moses' glory now "shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians." On the other hand, some features of the *Kavod*'s paradigm are still noticeable: the homilist understands Moses' luminosity as a covering with God's glory.[50] The author's further discussion in II.12.15 about the clothing of Christians and wrapping them in "divine and glorious garments" gives additional strength to this motif of Moses, covered with the luminous garments of God's glory.

The tendencies for internalizing the *Kavod* paradigm through implications of the concept of God's image found in Macarian Homilies demonstrate amazing similarities to some Jewish developments. The late Rabbinic midrashim attest to such traditions.[51] The origin of such

---

[49] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 114.

[50] The motif of covering with the Glory is also prominent in another Macarian passage which depicts Moses' shining countenance: "For blessed Moses provided us with a certain type through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze (II.15.10)." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74.

[51] In Rabbinic literature the traditions about Moses as a luminous conterpart of Adam also can be found. Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the *tselem*

theological innovations can be found in its rudimentary form already in some Jewish apocalypses, notably in *2 Enoch* from which we learn that the Lord created Adam after His Face. F. Andersen stresses the theological uniqueness of such creational imagery. He, however, does not clarify what the creation after the Lord's Face means in the broader textual context of the Slavonic apocalypse. The Lord's Face plays an important role in *2 Enoch's* theophanic descriptions being identified with the Lord's glorious form—His *Kavod*. In chapter 22 of *2 Enoch* the Lord's Face emits light and fire and serves as the source of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis. In this context, the creation of Adam after the Lord's Face demonstrates a remarkable effort toward merging the *Kavod* and *tselem* paradigms of the transformational vision.

The previous investigation shows the important role of the Adam–Moses connection in the evolution from outer to inner in the *Kavod* imagery. It is clear, however, that in the Macarian writings the internalizing of the *Kavod* paradigm is not confined solely to the reevaluation of Moses' *Gestalt*. The effort is much more radical. In fact, it is so revolutionary that it strikes even distinguished students of the mystical traditions. One of them, Gershom Scholem, points to the amazing Macarian tendency for mystical "reinterpretation" of the Merkabah vision of Ezekiel in which the human soul become itself the throne of glory.[52] In Homily II.1.1–2 Macarius writes:

> When Ezekiel the prophet beheld the divinely glorious vision, he described it in human terms but in a way full of mysteries that completely surpass the powers of the human mind… . And all of this which the

---

is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 182. *Deut. R.* 11.3 attests to such traditions: "Adam said to Moses: 'I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God.' Whence this? For it is said, 'and God created man in his own image' (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: 'I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me.' Whence? For it is said: 'his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated' (Deut. 34:7)." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939), 7. 173. Gottstein also gives another midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4 in which Moses is again Adam's luminous counterpart: "In the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt… In the beginning: 'and God created man in his image,' and in the desert: 'and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone.'" Cf. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1967), 3. 168.

[52] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961), 79.

> prophet saw in ecstasy or in a trance was indeed true and certain, but it was only signifying and foreshadowing something no less hidden, something divine and mysterious, "a mystery hidden for generations" (Col. 1:26) but that "has been revealed only in our time, the end of the ages," (1Pt. 1:20) when Christ appeared. For the prophet was viewing the mystery of the human soul that would receive its Lord and would become his throne of glory. For the soul that is deemed to be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye.[53]

Scholem, observing such a radical rethinking of classic *Kavod* imagery, further asks the legitimate question: "was there not a temptation to regard man himself as the representative of divinity, his soul as the throne of glory?"[54] Interestingly enough, this query directs us to the very heart of the Macarian theological enterprise in which the *Kavod* internalization become possible only as a consequence of the unique interrelationships between human and divine in the event of Christ's transfiguration.

Crystallization of the New Paradigm: The Macarian Account of the Lord's Transfiguration

The previous analysis shows that in the Macarian homilies Moses' shining countenance and the luminosity of Adam's prelapsarian *tselem* serve as metaphors for major paradigms of the transformational vision.

In the Macarian writings, one can also encounter a third paradigm of luminous transformation which is radically different from the previous two traditions. In a peculiar Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration[55] on Mt. Tabor, the duality of inner and outer in the *visio*

---

[53] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[54] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961), 79.

[55] The original Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem influenced by the *Kavod* paradigm in its classical Exodus' form. Several details of the account serve as important reminders: the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1986), 1–19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 80–93; M.E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969–1970) 305–317.

Dei is expressed in a new metaphor of the transformational vision—Christ's "Body[56] of Light."[57]

Macarius makes an important theological statement when he observes that in His Transfiguration Christ was not just covered by the Glory but "was transfigured into (μετεμορφώθη εἰς) divine glory and into infinite light (εἰς τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄπειρον)" (II.15.38).[58]

In II.15.38 the homilist elaborates this ingenious understanding of Christ's transfiguration in which the internal and external aspects of transformational mystical experience are absolutely resolved:

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning.[59] Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies… (II.15.38).[60]

---

[56] The verb from the Synoptic account implies that Jesus' body was changed. Cf. J. Behm, *TDNT*, 4.755–757.

[57] Another important testimony to the Lord's Body of Light is *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 17:7 which pictures the brilliant radiance of Christ's body in connection with Christ's image: "For He has shape, and He has every limb primarily and solely for beauty's sake, and not for use. For He has not eyes that He may see with them; for He sees on every side, since He is incomparably more brilliant in His body than the visual spirit which is in us, and He is more splendid than everything, so that in comparison with Him the light of the sun may be reckoned as darkness. Nor has He ears that He may hear; for He hears, perceives, moves, energizes, acts on every side. But He has the most beautiful shape on account of man, that the pure in heart may be able to see Him, that they may rejoice because they suffered. For He molded man in His own shape as in the grandest seal, in order that he may be the ruler and lord of all, and that all may be subject to him. Wherefore, judging that He is the universe, and that man is His image (for He is Himself invisible, but His image man is visible), the man who wishes to worship Him honours His visible image, which is man." A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950–1951), 8. 319–320. It is important that here Christ's luminosity is placed into the account of Adam's creation after God's image. The phrase "He is incomparably more brilliant in his body than the visual spirit which is in us" deserves particular attention since it can refer to the correspondence between the Lord's luminous "body" and the Adamic *tselem*.

[58] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122–123. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149–150.

[59] Origen in *Princ*. 2.3.7 remarks that the best and purest spirits must have some kind of body, being changed according to their degree of merit into an ethereal condition, and interprets "change" in 1 Cor 15:52 as "shining with light."

[60] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122–123. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149–150.

The language of the passage further reinforces the totality of this transformational vision—Christ's internal glory serves as the teleological source of his complete, luminous metamorphosis.

In the articulation of the newness of Christ's condition, Macarius thus offers a completely new paradigm of the beatific vision—the bodies of visionaries are now not simply covered externally with the divine light but are "lightened"[61] in the way as many lamps are lightened from the one:

> Similarly, as many lamps are lighted from the one, same fire, so also it is necessary that the bodies of the saints, which are members of Christ, become the same which Christ himself is. (II.15.38).[62]

In this new concept of the transformational vision, Macarius, however, sets a significant distinction between Christ's Transfiguration and human luminous transformation. In contrast to the Lord's metamorphosis, the bodies of mortals cannot be completely "transfigured into the divine glory" but rather simply become "glorified."

The hypostatic quality of Christ's luminous form is what differentiates Him from transformed Christians who are only predestined to participate in the light of His Glory and "have put on the raiment of ineffable light."[63] This articulation of the distinction between Christ's hypostasis and His light will play later an important role in Palamas' dialectics of God's essence and the divine energies.

Conclusion

It is time to return to the passage from the *Philokalia* which began this investigation. In comparison with the "traditional" cases of transformational visions, this account might appear as quite ambiguous. It demonstrates the absence of significant details of such visions in which the luminous metamorphosis of a visionary becomes possible as the consequence of the beatific vision of the glorious "form" of the Deity. The teleological necessity of such a divine form, in its external or internal

---

[61] It is noteworthy that the homilist applies the imagery of "covering" not only to the physical bodies of these Christians but also to their souls which according to him will be "covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

[62] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122–123. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149–150.

[63] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 44.

manifestations, seems to presuppose the very possibility of any luminous metamorphosis. On the contrary, in the *Philokalia* account a visionary does not see any luminous form, but "the open space within the heart," which, however, makes him entirely luminous.

The answer to this strange situation can be found in the Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor which plays a paradigmatic role in later Hesychastic visions of the divine light. Macarius' position implies that Christ in the Tabor story represents both aspects of the transformational vision. First, He is the Glory after which a visionary is transformed. Second, He is also the visionary himself, whose face and garments are transformed.[64] In the Macarian writings Christ's interior glory is poured out upon his external body, making it luminous.

> For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning. Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies… (II.15.38).[65]

In the light of the Macarian account of Christ's transfiguration, the requirement for the divine glorious form as the transforming source of the visionary experience becomes replaced by the notion of the divine energies. It becomes possible since the locus of the visionary's perspective now is not external to the divine luminous form, but is rather immanent within it. In this situation the dichotomy between the subject of the beautific vision and the object of the beautific vision can be easily overcome.

A Hesychast in his transformational vision intends to resemble Christ in the Transfiguration. He focuses his physical and intellectual gaze not on the outside but on the inside, upon his heart, "where all the powers of the soul reside," waiting patiently that the interior power of Christ will lighten him as a lamp, so he can "become the same which Christ himself is." Divine glory here, just as in the *Kavod* tradition, is still

---

[64] The luminous face and the transformed garments of Christ in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration may stress the role of Christ as a visionary of His own glory. It parallels the shining face of Moses after his visionary experience on Mount Sinai and to the transformation of visionaries' garments in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

[65] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122–123. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149–150.

confined within the anthropomorphic form, but there is a substantial difference—this human form is now the visionary himself, who imitates Christ's transfiguration, whose inner glory pours out exteriorly upon the body.

THE FLOODED ARBORETUMS: THE GARDEN TRADITIONS IN THE SLAVONIC VERSION OF *3 BARUCH* AND THE *BOOK OF GIANTS*[*]

Introduction

The apocalypse known as *3 Baruch* depicts a celestial tour during which an angelic guide leads a visionary through five heavens revealing to him the wonders of the upper realm. Scholars have noted that some details of this heavenly journey resonate with the visionary accounts found in Enochic materials.[1] Despite the similarities, the author of *3 Baruch* seems to avoid making direct references to the motifs and themes associated with Enochic tradition. In the regard, Richard Bauckham comments: "It is remarkable that *3 Baruch*, which throughout chapters 2–5 is preoccupied with the stories of Gen 2–11, makes no reference to the Watchers."[2] He suggests, further, that the author of this apocalypse "is perhaps engaged in a polemical rejection of the Enoch traditions, so that as well as substituting Baruch for Enoch he also substitutes the human builders for the angelic Watchers. Instead of deriving evil on earth from the fall of the Watchers, he emphasizes its origin in the Garden of Eden."[3] In response to this observation, Martha Himmelfarb agrees that various textual features of *3 Baruch* reveal a polemic against

---

[*] I am indebted to professor Francis Andersen for his insight and encouragement in convincing me to undertake this study. My research was inspired by his illuminating remarks on the connection between *3 Baruch* and the Enochic traditions.

[1] F.I. Andersen, "The Sun in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *Xristianskij Vostok* 4.10 (2006) 380–412; R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (NovTsup, 93; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill: 1998); H.E. Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *OTP*, 1.653–679; M.I. Sokolov, "Feniks v apokrifah ob Enohe i Varuhe," *Novyj sbornik statej po slavjanovedeniju, sostavlennyj i izdannyj uchenikami V.I. Lamanskogo* (St. Peterburg, 1905), 395–405.

[2] R. Bauckham, "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," *JTS* 41 (1990) 355–385, esp. 372.

[3] Ibid., 372.

the Enochic literature.[4] These observations are intriguing and deserve further investigation. Even a brief look at the apocalypse shows that despite a conspicuous coloring of the Adamic interpretation of the origin of evil, the details of *3 Baruch*'s descriptions of the garden expose the motifs and themes linked to another prominent story in which the source of evil is traced to the myth of the Watchers/Giants.

This study will investigate the account of paradise found in *3 Baruch* 4 and its possible connection with Enochic and Noachic traditions.

I. *The Paradise Traditions of the Slavonic Version of* 3 Baruch

Third Baruch became first known in its Slavonic version[5] and only later

[4] M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 93.

[5] For publications of the Slavonic MSS of *3 Baruch*, see E. Hercigonja, "'Videnie Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63–93; H.E. Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha," *Polata knigopisnaja* 7 (1983) 49–56; J. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofija: Pridvorna Pechatnica, 1925), 193–200; P.A. Lavrov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," *Sbornik otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti (SORJaS)* 67/3 (1899) 149–151; S. Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo," *Starine* 18 (1886) 203–209; M.I. Sokolov, "Apokrificheskoe otkrovenie Varuha," *Drevnosti, Trudy slavjanskoi komissii imperatorskogo Moskovskago arheologicheskogo obshchestva* 4 (1907), 201–258; N. Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," in: "Apokrificheskie Teksty," *SORJaS* 58 (1894), 48–54. For translations of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*, see G.N. Bonwetsch, "Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch," *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1896) 91–101; W. Hage, "*Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse*," in: *Apokalypsen* (ed. W. Hage, K.-G. Eckart, *et al*; JSHRZ 5/1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974) 15–44; Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," 1.653–655; A.G. Kuz'min and A. Ju. Karpov, *Zlatostruj. Drevnjaja Rus' X–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Molodaja gvardija, 1990), 276–282; W.R. Morfill, "The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavonic," *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (Texts 5/1; ed. J.A. Robinson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), 95–102. For research on the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*, see: H.E. Gaylord, "How Sataniel Lost His '-el,'" *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309; idem, "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch," *Slovo* 37 (1987) 91–115; *idem*, "The Slavonic Version of III Baruch" (Ph.D. diss., Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983); W. Lüdtke, "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 218–231; A. Ju. Karpov, "O kalendare slavjanskoj knigi 'Otkrovenie Varuha,'" *Palestinskij sbornik* 32 (1993) 81–83; P.A. Lavrov, "Zametka ob apokrifah v rukopisi Publichnoj Biblioteki Grech. 70," *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61–64; B. Philonenko-Sayar, "La version slave de l'Apocalypse de Baruch," *La littérature intertestamentaire*: *Colloque de Strasbourg, 17–19 octobre 1983* (Bibliothèque des centres d'études supérieures spécialisés: Travaux du Centre d'études supérieures spécialisé d'histoire des religions de Strasbourg; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1985), 89–97; Sokolov, "Feniks v apokrifah ob Enohe i Varuhe," 395–405; idem, "O fenikse po apokrif. knigam Enoha i Varuha," in *Drevnosti. Trudy slavjanskoj komissii imperatorskogo Moskovskogo arheologicheskogo*

were the Greek manuscripts of the book uncovered.[6] Despite the availability of the Greek evidence, scholars noted that in some parts of the pseudepigraphon the Slavonic text seems to preserve more original material. H.E. Gaylord's newly assembled Slavonic sources show several areas where Slavonic appears to be closer to the original.[7] One of such areas concerns the fourth chapter of the text. Gaylord observes that the overall structure and content of chap. 4 in Slavonic seem closer to the original[8] than the extant Greek version, which in this part "has suffered the most at the hands of Christian scribes."[9] Chapter 4 of the Slavonic version contains several important details that are missing from the Greek version, including the story of the angels planting the garden. Our investigation of chap. 4 will deal with the Slavonic version and will be supplemented by the Greek version.

In *3 Baruch 4* the reader finds Baruch in the middle of his heavenly journey. The angelic guide continues to show him celestial wonders. In the beginning of the chapter, Baruch sees a serpent on a stone mountain who "eats earth like grass." Then, in 4:6, Baruch asks his *angelus interpres* to show him the tree that deceived Adam. In response to this request, Baruch hears the story about the planting and destruction of the heavenly garden. In the Slavonic version, the story has the following form:

---

obshchestva 4/1 [Moscow] (1907); R. Stichel, "Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse," in *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (ed. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/177; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 116–128; É. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *RHR* 69 (1950) 22–52, 176–218; *idem*, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave," *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23–48; *idem*, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: Leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1953) 47–52; B.M. Zagrebin, "O prishozhdenii i sud'be nekotoryh slavjanskih palimpsestov Sinaja," in *Iz istorii rukopisnyh i staropechatnyh sobranij Otdela rukopisej i redkih knig GPB (Issledovanija, obzory, publikacii). Sbornik nauchnyh trudov* (Leningrad, 1979), 61–80.

[6] J.-C. Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece* (PVTG, 2; Leiden: Brill, 1967).

[7] Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 655.

[8] In his recent research D. Harlow (*The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christiantity* [SVTP 12; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1996], 40) supports this position, observing that "in some instances the Slavonic likely does possess an equal or better claim to priority than does the Greek, as is the case in chapters 4–5." See also his comment on p. 150: "certainly the Slavonic presents a more coherent form of material in chapters 4–5."

[9] Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 657.

And the angel said to me "When God made the garden and commanded Michael to gather *two hundred* thousand[10] and three angels so that they could plant the garden, Michael planted the olive and Gabriel, the apple; Uriel,[11] the nut; Raphael, the melon; and Sataniel,[12] the vine. For at first his name in former times was Sataniel, and similarly all the angels planted the various trees."[13] And again I Baruch said to the angel, "Lord, show me the tree through which the serpent deceived Eve and Adam." And the angel said to me, "Listen, Baruch. In the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire which Sataniel spread over Eve and Adam, and because of this God has cursed the vine because Sataniel had planted it, and by that he deceived the protoplast Adam and Eve." And I Baruch said to the angel, "Lord, if God has cursed the vine and its seed, then how can it be of use now?" And the angel said to me, "Rightly you ask me. When God made the Flood upon the earth, he drowned every firstling, and he destroyed 104 thousand giants, and the water rose above the highest mountains 20 cubits above the mountains, and the water entered into the garden, (*and destroyed all flower*),[14] bringing out one shoot from the vine as God withdrew the

---

[10] Some MSS read "two thousand." See Gaylord, "Slavjanskij Tekst," 52.

[11] Slav. **оурилъ** (Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst," 52); Slav. **Сарасаилъ** (Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*, 196). Variants of this angel's name in the Slavonic MSS of *3 Baruch* show that the author/editor knew the Enochic variations involving the names Uriel, Phanuel, and Sariel.

[12] Slav. **Сатанаилъ/Сотонаилъ** (Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst," 52; Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 48–54). Both Greek manuscripts read Σαμουηλ (Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 85).

[13] After this verse, several Slavonic MSS of the Russian group contain the following tradition: "And he said to Michael, 'Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made.' And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, 'To mud and dirt I will never bow down.' And he said, 'I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest.' Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, 'These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God.' And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise. And they ascended in order to bow down to God. Then having gone, Sataniel found the serpent and he made himself into a worm. And he said to the serpent, 'Open (your mouth), consume me into your belly.' And he went through the fence into Paradise, wanting to deceive Eve. But because of that one I was cast out from the glory of God. And the serpent ate him and went into Paradise and found Eve and said, 'What did God command you to eat from the food of Paradise?' And Eve said, 'From every tree of Paradise we eat; from this tree God commanded us not to eat.' And having heard Sataniel said to her, 'God begrudged the way you live lest you be immortal; take and eat and you will see and give it to Adam.' And both ate and the eyes of both were opened and they saw that they were naked." (Gaylord, "How Sataniel lost his '-el,'" 305). For the Slavonic text, see Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 50.

[14] Slav. **и възатъ вьсь цвѣтъ** (Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst," 52). This expression can also be translated as "and took all that was blooming…." This sentence about

> waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark and found the vine lying on the ground, and did not recognize it having only heard about it and its form. He thought to himself, saying, "This is truly the vine which Sataniel planted in the middle of the garden, by which he deceived Eve and Adam; because of this God cursed it and its seed. So if I plant it, then will God not be angry with me?" And he knelt down on (his) knees and fasted 40 days. Praying and crying, he said, "Lord, if I plant this, what will happened?" And the Lord sent the angel Sarasael; he declared to him, "Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name, and change it for the better" (*3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–15).[15]

The depiction conveys several rare traditions about the garden, of which two are especially important for this investigation: the angels planting the garden and the flooding of this garden by the waters of the Deluge. Both of these traditions are preserved only in this pseudepigraphon. There are, however, some early materials that seem to allude to the same rare traditions about the garden's planting and flooding. One of these sources includes the fragments of the *Book of Giants*.

II. *The Garden Traditions in the* Book of Giants

The composition known as the *Book of Giants* exists only in a very fragmentary form preserved in Jewish and Manichean sources, including the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* found at Qumran,[16] the

---

the destruction of all vegetation in the garden is not included in Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version, published in *OTP*. The reading, however, can be found in Gaylord's publication of the Slavonic text of *3 Baruch* in "Slavjanskij tekst," 52. See also Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 51.

[15] Trans. Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 1.666. Here and later I used Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* and follow his division of chapters and verses. The Slavonic citations of *3 Baruch* are drawn from the following publications of the Slavonic MSS: Hercigonja, "'Videnie Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," 63–93; Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst," 49–56; Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi*, 193–200; Lavrov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 149–151; Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo," 203–209; Sokolov, "Apokrificheskoe otkrovenie Varuha," 201–258; Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 48–54.

[16] É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4 (XXII): Textes Araméens, Première Partie, 4Q529–549* (DJD, 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001); J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976): K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); *idem*, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992);

fragments of the Manichean *Book of Giants*,[17] and the later Jewish text known as the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.[18]

In these materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, we find the themes of the planting and the destroying of a garden. The Aramaic fragment of the *Book of Giants* from Qumran (4Q530) and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* depict a dream in which the giant Hahyah, the son of the watcher Shemihazah, sees a certain garden planted and then destroyed.

4Q530 lines 3–12 read:

> … Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to […] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, […in] my dream; I have seen in this night […] gardeners and they were watering […] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk […] I watched until tongues of fire from […] all the water and the fire burned in all […] Here is the end of the dream.[19]

The fragment seems to depict certain gardeners planting or sustaining a garden by watering its numerous "roots." It also portrays the destruction of the same garden by water and fire. The description of both events is very fragmentary and many features of the story appear to be missing from 4Q530. Both motifs seem better preserved in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, which provides additional important details. It refers directly to the planting of the garden by using the Hebrew verb **נטע**:

> … One night the sons of Shemhazai, Hiwwa and Hiyya,[20] saw (visions) in dream, and both of them saw dreams. One saw the great stone spread over the earth…The other (son) saw a garden, *planted* (**נטוע**)[21] whole with

---

J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997).

[17] W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 52–74; P.O. Skjærvø, "Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of Giants. Irano-Manichaica III," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48/1–2 (1995) 187–223; W. Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch," in *Hommages et opera minora 9: Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica 23/Second Series, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 491–505.

[18] I use the Hebrew texts and the English translation of the *Midrash* published in Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 321–328.

[19] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 2.1063.

[20] = Hahyah.

[21] Trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 325.

> (many) kinds of trees and (many) kinds of precious stones. And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all the trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches. When they awoke from their sleep they arose in confusion, and, going to their father, they related to him the dreams. He said to them: "The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons."[22]

Besides 4Q530 and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the Hahyah/Hiyya dream is mentioned also in the Middle Persian Kawân fragment *j* of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W.B. Henning. The evidence, however, is very terse and ambiguous,[23] containing only one line: "Nariman[24] saw a gar[den full of] trees in rows. Two hundred … came out, the trees … ."[25]

Henning suggests that this fragment should be interpreted in the light of another Middle Persian fragment *D* (M 625c) which links the Watchers with the trees:

> … outside … and … left … read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus … and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And … over … pulled out … over … .[26]

Several important details in these descriptions from Jewish and Manichean sources should be clarified. The first concerns the subjects planting the garden. 4Q530 refers to the gardeners watering numerous roots issued from their trunk. Who are these gardeners? J. Milik was first to identify the "gardeners" as *angelic* beings. He argued that the gardeners are "guardian angels" or "bailiffs of the world-garden" and are matched by the shepherds in the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* 89:59 and 90:1.[27] L. Stuckenbruck agrees that the "gardeners" might be angelic beings but notes that there is reason to question whether the "gardeners" are meant to represent *good* angelic beings. He suggests that in light of 4Q530 line 8 the ultimate outcome of the "gardeners'" work seems to be the production of "great shoots" from the root source,

---

[22] Ibid., 328.

[23] In view of its extremely fragmentary nature, this evidence can be considered only as tentative.

[24] = Hahyah.

[25] Trans. Henning, "Book of the Giants," 57 and 60.

[26] Ibid., 66.

[27] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 304.

which, in Stuckenbruck's opinion, signifies "the birth of the giants from the women." He further argues that "watering" activity is a metaphor for impregnation and the "gardeners," in fact, represent fallen angelic beings, the Watchers.[28] J. Reeves had earlier suggested that the "gardeners" might represent the Watchers prior to their apostasy. He notes that the image of the gardeners "watering" the garden may allude to the initial educational mission of the Watchers, who, according to *Jub.* 4:15, were originally sent by God on earth to instruct humans in moral conduct.[29]

The second detail of the description concerns the imagery of the trees. It seems that the trees symbolize not the vegetation, but the inhabitants of the garden: angelic, human, or composite creatures. Arboreal metaphors are often used in Enochic tradition to describe the Watchers and the Giants (cf. *CD* 2.17–19).

Another important detail is found in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, in which the destruction of the garden is associated with the flood and Noah's escape from it. 4Q530 line 10 also seems to allude to the flood, since Hahyah's dream mentions the destruction of the garden by fire and *water*. A short Qumran fragment, 6Q8, also provides evidence for the connection of Hahyah's dream with Noah's escape. F. García Martínez observes that the reference to Noah and his sons in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has its equivalent in 6Q8 line 2,[30] which speaks of three shoots preserved from the flood so as to signify the escape of Noah and his three sons.[31]

J. Reeves offers the following reconstruction of the dream based on the two fragments:[32]

> Hahyah beholds in his vision a grove of trees carefully attended by gardeners. This tranquil scene is interrupted by the sudden appearance (or transformation?) of two hundred figures within this garden. The result

---

[28] Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114.

[29] Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95, 96.

[30] 6Q8 line 2: "its three roots [… and] while I was [watching] came […] all this orchard, and […]" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2. 1149).

[31] García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 101. See also Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 87 and 95; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 309.

[32] Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95–96; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114–115. It should be noted that any arrangement of the fragments must be considered tentative. On this issue, see L.T. Stuckenbruck, "The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition," *JSP* 16 (1997) 3–24, esp. 10.

> of this invasion was the production of "great" shoots sprouting up from the roots of the trees. While Hahyah viewed this scene, emissaries from Heaven arrived and ravaged the garden with water and fire, leaving only one tree bearing three branches as the sole survivor of the destruction.[33]

A comparison of this description from the *Book of Giants* with the story found in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4 shows that both accounts seem to have three similar events that follow one another in the same sequence: the planting of the garden, the destruction of the garden, and the escape of one tree from the destruction. These intriguing similarities call for a more thorough investigation of the parallels between the garden traditions found in the *3 Baruch* 4 and the *Book of Giants*.

III. *The Angelic Planting of the Garden (*3 Apoc. Bar. *4:7–8)*

The motif of angels planting the garden is uniquely preserved in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*.[34] In the text, the tale about the planting comes from the mouth of Baruch's angelic guide. From him the visionary learns that God commanded Michael to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the garden. The story further tells that Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael and Sataniel planted five trees. Other angels also planted "various trees."

Several features in the story of the planting found in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–8 seem to resonate with the account found in the *Book of Giants*. These details include the following significant points:

1. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 mentions two hundred thousand and three angels planting the garden;
2. the fallen angel Sataniel also takes part in planting the "trees";
3. according to the story, Sataniel plants the bad tree—the tree of deception;
4. the tree is described as a sinful desire that the fallen angel had for humans;
5. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 mentions the planting of five types of trees in the garden.

---

[33] Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95.

[34] The Greek version contains only a very short reference to Samael's planting of the tree: "It is the vine which the angel Samael planted (ἐφύτευσεν) by which the Lord God became angered, and he cursed him and his planting (τὴν φυτείαν αὐτοῦ)." Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 667; see also Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 85.

1. The first feature of *3 Baruch* 4 that recalls the *Book of Giants* is the number of angelic hosts involved in planting the garden. *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 tells that God commanded Michael[35] to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the garden. The numeral two hundred thousand and three, reserved here for the number of angelic hosts, gives a clue to the reader that the angelic "gardeners" described in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 are somehow related to the fallen Watchers, who in the *Book of Giants* "planted" gigantic "trees" on the earth through their iniquities.[36] In early Enochic accounts, the numeral "two hundred" often refers to the number of the Watchers descending on Mount Hermon.[37] Some later Enochic accounts, however, tend to exaggerate the number of the fallen Watchers, depicting them as two hundred thousand or two hundred myriads. For example, in the longer recension *2 Enoch* 18:3, the angelic guides give Enoch the following information about the Watchers: "These are the *Gregori* (Watchers), who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail."[38] It is noteworthy that in *3 Baruch* 4, similar to *2 Enoch* 18, the tradition about the two hundred myriads of angelic beings is creatively conflated with the name of Sataniel.[39]

---

[35] The commissioning of Michael for the mission of gathering two hundred thousand angels might allude to Michael's role in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 10:11–15), where he is responsible for the affairs connected with Shemihazah and the Watchers.

[36] That three angels are mentioned in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 in conjunction with the two hundred thousand angels might be a reference to a tradition in which the three principal angels (Raphael, Uriel, Gabriel) were called by the fourth principal angel, Michael, to fulfill God's command to plant the garden. Another explanation of the angelic triad in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 is that is could represent the leaders of the Watchers group. The later Enochic accounts often speak about *three*, not two, leaders of the fallen Watchers. See *3 Enoch* 4:5–6 "… And the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me [Enoch] in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height" (P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.258). See also *3 Enoch* 5:9 "… it was only because Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael taught them sorceries that they brought them down and employed them, for otherwise they would not have been able to bring them down" (*OTP*, 1.260). Annette Yoshiko Reed ("From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 [§§7–8] and Jewish Reception-History of *1 Enoch*," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8/2 [2001] 105–136, esp. 110) argues that the tradition about Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael reflects "direct knowledge of the account of the fall of the angels in *1 Enoch* 6–11."

[37] See *1 Enoch* 6:6: "And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon." (M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* [2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978], 2.68).

[38] F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.130.

[39] The possibility that the author of *3 Baruch* was cognizant of the myth of the

2. In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7–8, one of the angelic creatures planting the garden along with the four principal angels (Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael) is the fallen angel Sataniel. The description of Sataniel as the gardener is puzzling. The pseudepigraphic texts usually follow the biblical account[40] that claims that the garden was planted by God (Gen 2:8).[41] This motif of the fallen "planter" might, therefore, parallel the *Book of Giants*, where the fallen angels are also depicted as gardeners.

3. In *3 Baruch* and in the *Book of Giants*, the "planting of trees/tree" is part of the angelic plot to corrupt the human race. In the *Book of Giants*, the "gardeners," represented by fallen angelic beings, "plant" bad "trees"—the wicked offspring that, through their enormous appetites, brought many disasters to the antedeluvian generation. In *3 Baruch* 4, the "gardener," the fallen angel Sataniel, also plants a tree designed to cause the fall and degradation of the human race. In *3 Baruch*, the vine tree eventually becomes the tool through which Adam and Eve were deceived and corrupted.

4. The account in *3 Baruch* connects the tree planted by Sataniel with the "sinful desire" spread by this fallen angel over the first humans. In 4:8, the *angelus interpres* tells Baruch that "in the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire[42] which Sataniel spread over Adam and Eve."[43] This reference to the "sinful desire" of the fallen angel over humans is intriguing since it alludes to the terminology found in Enochic tradition. Thus *1 Enoch* 6 says that the Watchers had sinful desire for human creatures.[44] The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also uses the term "evil desire" or "evil inclination" (Heb. **יצר הרע**) in

---

Watchers is supported also by the information found in other parts of the book. According to Bauckham ("Early Jewish Visions of Hell," 372), the author of *3 Bar* indeed knew about the story of the Watchers. He suggests that two groups of condemned angels in chaps. 2 and 3 of *3 Baruch* parallel two groups of Watchers in the second and fifth heaven from *2 Enoch* 7 and 18.

[40] I am indebted to Professor Michael Stone for this clarification.

[41] See also 4Q504 8:4–6 "… [… Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory […] [… the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge […] [… in the gard]en of Eden, which you had planted…" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2. 1009.

[42] Slav. **похоть грѣховнаю**. (Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo," 206).

[43] Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 666.

[44] *1 Enoch* 6:1–2a: "And it came to pass, when the sons of men had increased, that in those days there were born to them fair and beautiful daughters. And the angels, the sons of heaven, saw them and desired them." (Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.67).

reference to the relationships between the descended Watchers and the "daughters of man":

> Forthwith the Holy One allowed the *evil inclination* (**יצר הרע**) to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, "When the sons of God saw the daughters of man," they could not restrain their inclination.[45]

In the story from the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the evil desire of the Watchers over humans seems to come as consequence of the Watchers' disrespect for humanity in general and the first human creature in particular.[46] It is intriguing that some Russian manuscripts of *3 Baruch* contain the passage about Sataniel's refusal[47] to venerate Adam,[48] which

---

[45] Trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327.

[46] *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 1–4: "When the generation of Enosh arose and practiced idolatry and when the generation of the flood arose and corrupted their actions, the Holy One—Blessed be He—was grieved that He had created man, as it is said, 'And God repented that he created man, and He grieved at heart.' Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: 'O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, "Do not create man"?' The Holy One—Blessed be He—said to them; 'Then what shall become of the world?' They said before Him: 'We will suffice (Thee) instead of it.' He said: 'It is revealed and (well) known to me that if peradventure you had lived in that (earthly) world, the evil inclination would have ruled you just as much as it rules over the sons of man, but you would be more stubborn than they.' They said before Him: 'Give us Thy sanction and let us descend {and dwell} among the creatures and then Thou shall see how we shall sanctify Thy name.' He said to them: 'Descend and dwell ye among them.' Forthwith the Holy One allowed the evil inclination to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, 'When the sons of God saw the daughters of man,' they could not restrain their inclination" (trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327).

[47] The Adamic Story of Satan's refusal to venerate Adam is attested in many Jewish, Christian, and Muslim materials, including Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13–15; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4; Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*; *Cave of Treasures* 2:10–24; and *Qur'an* 2:31–39; 7:11–18; 15:31–48; 17:61–65; 18:50; 20:116–123; 38:71–85. On Satan's refusal, see M. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve," *JTS* 44 (1993) 145–148; G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105–134.

[48] "And he said to Michael, 'Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made.' And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, 'To mud and dirt I will never bow down.' And he said, 'I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest.' Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet

recalls the account found in *Midrash* 1–4.[49] Gaylord, however, does not include this account in his English translation of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* in *OTP*, considering it to be a later interpolation.

5. Finally, *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7 refers to five kinds of trees. The text says that the olive tree was planted by Michael, the apple by Gabriel, the nut by Uriel, the melon by Raphael, and the vine by Sataniel. Although the number of the principal angels seems unusual, the reference to the "five trees" excites interest in light of a passage found among the fragments of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W.B. Henning. This fragment, similar to *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:7, also operated with the notion of the "five trees": "…evil-intentioned…from where…he came. The Misguided fail to recognize the five elements, [the five kinds of] trees, the five (kinds of) animals" (frag. h).[50]

In both Enochic and Adamic accounts, the flooded garden is depicted as a place where the drama of the primordial evil unfolds. Enochic and Adamic traditions often compete with each other, offering different explanations of the origin of evil in the world.[51] The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the story of the Watchers, in which the descended Watchers corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. By contrast, the Adamic story traces the source of evil to the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. These two accounts share many common details that reveal a persistent and strenuous polemic between the two traditions. The description in *3 Baruch* 4 of the flooded garden as the arena of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic beings of the highest status brings the two traditions closer together.

---

said, 'These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God.' And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise" (Gaylord, "How Sataniel Lost His '-el,'" 305).

[49] "Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: 'O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, Do not create man?'" (trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327).

[50] Trans. Henning, "Book of the Giants," 63.

[51] M.E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149.

IV. *The Flood in the Garden (3 Apoc. Bar. 4:10–11)*

In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:8, the angel tells the visionary about the evil role the vine tree played in Sataniel's deception of Adam and Eve. According to the story, God, as a result of this deception, cursed the vine and its seed. Upon hearing this story, Baruch asked the angel why, despite God's curse, the vine can still exist. The angel told Baruch about the flood in the heavenly garden.

The story recounts that God first caused the flood upon the earth, which led to the drowning of "every firstling," including 104,000 giants. Then the water rose above the highest mountains and flooded the heavenly garden. As God withdrew the water, "all flower" was destroyed except for one shoot from the vine. When the land appeared from the water, Noah went out from his ark and discovered the vine lying on the ground.

Several points of this flood story resemble the account found in the *Book of Giants*, including the following details:

1. In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10 and in the *Book of Giants*, the flooding of the garden is parallel to the flood on the earth.
2. In both traditions the destruction of all vegetation (in *3 Baruch* "all flower")[52] in the garden "mirrors" the destruction of all flesh and the giants on earth.
3. In both traditions the surviving "plant" from the flooded garden is parallel to the escape of Noah from the flood.

1. Later rabbinic materials sometimes operate with the notion of two gardens: the celestial garden of Eden and the terrestrial garden. In *3 Enoch* 5:5–6 we learn that before the generation of Enosh had sinned, God's *Shekinah* freely traveled from one garden to the other:

> When the Holy One, blessed be he, went out and in from the garden to Eden, and from Eden to the garden, from the garden to heaven, and from heaven to the garden of Eden, all gazed at the bright image of *Shekinah* and were unharmed—until the coming of the generation of Enosh, who was the chief of all the idolaters in the world.[53]

The story of the garden in *3 Baruch* 4 might represent an early tradition about the two gardens, since in this apocalypse the garden becomes the locus of celestial and terrestrial events at the same time. In the

[52] Slav. **вьсь цвѣтъ** (Gaylord, "Slavjansij tekst," 52).
[53] Trans. Alexander, "*3 Enoch*," 260.

story of the flood in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10–11, the events taking place in heaven and on earth are depicted as if they were to mirror each other: the destruction of "all flesh," including the giants on earth, "mirrors" the destruction of "all flower" in the heavenly garden. Both accounts also mention survivors, the patriarch Noah from the flooded earth and one plant from the flooded heavenly garden. This parallelism resembles the one in the *Book of Giants*, where the dream(s) about the destroyed "vegetation" of the garden and the single preserved shoot symbolized the drowned giants and Noah's miraculous escape.

2. As we mentioned above, in the Enochic traditions the fallen angels and their offspring are often depicted through arboreal imagery. CD 2.17–19 refers to the giants as tall cedars.[54] The *Book of Giants* supports this tendency: in the Manichean fragments of this composition, the Watchers are unambiguously associated with the trees.[55] The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also seems to take the vegetation of the garden as a symbol of the Watchers/Giants group. This correspondence is made not directly but through parallelism. In the *Midrash*, Shemhazai's statement about the flood on earth follows immediately after Hiyya's dream about the destruction of the trees. The two events seem to "mirror" each other in such a way that the first depicts the second symbolically.

3 Apoc. Bar. 4:10 follows the same pattern, portraying the destruction of "all flesh" and the giants on earth and the destruction of "all flower" in the heavenly garden as two "mirroring" processes taking place in the celestial and terrestrial realms. The similarities between the descriptions in *3 Baruch* 4 and the *Book of Giants* seem not to be coincidental. In addition, the description of "all flesh" in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10 includes a direct reference to the drowned giants.[56]

---

[54] "For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heaven fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell." (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.555).

[55] "… outside … and … left … read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus … and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And … over … pulled out … over …." (Henning, "Book of the Giants," 66).

[56] It is possible that *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:3 also attests to the traditions of the giants. The text says that Baruch's angelic guide showed him a serpent who "drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass." This description might allude to the appetites of the giants who were notorious for consuming everything alive on

3. The next is the identification of Noah with the "escaped plant." In the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the giant Hiyya beholds in his dream one tree with three branches that survived the destruction of the garden. The text tells that "an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches."[57] A verse later, the story switches to Noah and his three sons:[58] "He [Shemhazai] said to them [Hiwwa and Hiyya]: 'The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons.'"[59] In *Midrash* 10b–11a, the reference to Noah and his three sons enduring the flood follows immediately after the symbolic depiction of the tree with three branches surviving the destruction. Although the *Midrash* does not directly identify the tree with Noah, it makes the indentification obvious by correlating these two descriptions.

The same correlation is seen in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:10b–11, where the reference to Noah and his escape follows immediately after the statement about the preserved shoot: "and the water entered into the garden and destroyed every flower, bringing out one shoot from the vine as God withdrew the waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark."[60] It is important, however, that the escaped "tree," which in the *Book of Giants* was associated with the righteous remnant, becomes associated in *3 Baruch* with the evil deception. This difference might point to the polemical character of *3 Baruch*'s appropriation of Enochic imagery.

---

the surface of the earth. The *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of Giants* also attest to the enormous appetites of the giants. The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has it that "each of them eats daily a thousand camels, a thousand horses, a thousand oxen, and all kinds (of animals)" (trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 328).

57 Trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 328.

58 Associations of Noah with the plant abound. e.g., *1 Enoch* 10:16: "Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth …. And let the plant of righteousness and truth appear" (Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.90). For a survey of the evidence, see Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 99–100. Scholars believe that 6Q8 line 2 also refers to the story of Noah and his three sons.

59 Trans. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 328.

60 Trans. Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 666.

V. *The Noachic Narrative (3 Apoc. Bar. 4:11–15)*

3 Apoc. Bar. 4:11–15 deals with Noah's story. It depicts the patriarch after his debarkation seeing the shoot of vine lying on the ground. Noah hesitates to plant the vine, knowing the fatal role this plant had in deceiving Adam and Eve. Puzzled, Noah decides to ask the Lord in prayer if he can plant the vine. The Lord sends the angel Sarasael, who delivers to Noah the following command: "Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name and change it for the better."[61] Sarasael's address to Noah is important for establishing the connection between *3 Baruch* 4 and the broader Enochic/Noahic traditions. It reveals that the author of *3 Baruch* was familiar not only with the details of Noah's escape from the flood that are found in the extant materials of the *Book of Giants* but also with the peculiar details of Noah's story in the *Book of the Watchers* and in the traditions associated with the *Book of Noah*.

The Greek and Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch* 10:1–3 attest that God commissioned Sariel to inform Noah about the approaching flood.[62] This story might possibly parallel Sarasael's[63] revelation to Noah in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:15, but Sariel's revelation in *1 Enoch* 10:1–3 does not contain any information about the plant. It may be, however, that the "original" reading of *1 Enoch* 10:3 survived in its entirety not in the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* but in the text preserved by Syncellus,[64] which corresponds closely to the Aramaic evidence.[65] In the passage found in Syncellus, God commissioned Sariel to tell Noah not only about his escape from the flood but also about a *plant*: "And now instruct the righteous one

---

[61] Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 668.

[62] *1 Enoch* 10:1–3: "And then the Most High, the Great and Holy One, spoke and sent Arsyalalyur to the son of Lamech, and said to him: Say to him in my name 'Hide yourself,' and reveal to him the end which is coming, for the whole earth will be destroyed, and a deluge is about to come on all the earth, and what is in it will be destroyed. And now teach him that he may escape, and (that) his offspring may survive for the whole earth" (Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 87).

[63] Sarasael represents here the corruption of Sariel, the angelic name of the archangel Uriel also known in various traditions under the name of Phanuel. On the Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel connection, see "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*," in: *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 9; London; T&T Clark, 2004), 2.59–76.

[64] M. Black (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* [SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 133) observes that "the longer text of Sync. seems closer to an original."

[65] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 161–162.

what to do, and the son of Lamech, that he may save his life and escape for all time; and from him a plant shall be planted and established for all generations for ever."[66]

Although "a plant" in this revelation can be taken as a symbolic reference to the restored humanity[67] or to Noah himself, who is described in *1 Enoch* 10:16 as the "plant of righteousness and truth," some texts associated with Enochic traditions reveal that, besides "planting" justice and righteousness, Noah was involved literally in the planting of the vine. Thus, *Jub.* 7:1, for example, says that "during the seventh week, in its first year, in this jubilee Noah planted a vine at the mountain (whose name was Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat) on which the ark had come to rest. It produced fruit in the fourth year."[68] Here, just as in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:13–15, the planting of the vine is associated with Noah's debarkation.

Noah's story as found in *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:11–16 gives additional support to the hypothesis about the existence of the materials associated with the *Book of Noah*. F. García Martínez's pioneering research demonstrates that the materials of the *Book of Noah* are closely associated with the Enochic/Noachic traditions found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the Qumran materials, and Syncellus.[69] In *3 Baruch* 4 several traditions associated with the *Book of Noah* appear to be intimately interconnected, which may point to their common origin in the *Book of Noah*. For example, In *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:15–17, Sarasael tells Noah about the dangers of the vine. The angel tells him that the plant still retains its evil. This revelation about *the plant and the evil it possesses* recalls another passage possibly associated with the *Book of Noah*, namely, the tradition about the angelic

---

[66] Black, *Book of Enoch*, 30.

[67] P.A. Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4.3 (1997) 312–313, esp. 317. See also S. Fujita, "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 30–45.

[68] J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 2.43.

[69] García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 1–44. Even though the *Book of Noah* is not listed in the ancient catalogues of the apocryphal books, the writings attributed to Noah are mentioned in such early materials as the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:13; 21:10), the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran, and the Greek fragment of the Levi document from Mount Athos. In addition to the titles of the lost *Book of Noah*, several fragmentary materials associated with the early Noachic traditions have survived. Most researchers agree that some parts of the lost *Book of Noah* "have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* and Jubilees and that some manuscripts of Qumran preserve some traces of it" (García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 26).

revelation to Noah recorded in *Jub.* 10:1–14, which has it that Noah was taught by angels about *the plants and evil spirits*.[70]

VI. *Conclusion*

1. The foregoing analysis has demonstrated a number of intriguing parallels between the theme of the garden in *3 Baruch* 4 and similar traditions associated with the materials of the *Book of Giants*.[71] In both accounts, the garden is depicted as the place of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic being(s). Although *3 Baruch* 4 is written from the Adamic perspective,[72] this account demonstrates several details that are absent from "traditional" Adamic accounts but can be found in the Enochic tradition. This suggests that the author of *3 Baruch* might be involved in anti-Enochic polemics, borrowing and rewriting Enochic motifs and themes from the Adamic perspective. Therefore, the story of the planting and the destruction of the garden in *3 Baruch* seems to represent the locus of intense debates involving substantial rewriting of the "original" Enochic/Noahic motifs and themes. The details of the Enochic Watchers/Giants story appear to be rearranged[73] and transferred to new characters of the Adamic story, including Samael/Sataniel and the serpent.[74]

---

[70] *Jub.* 10:11b–14 "All of the evil ones who were savage we tied up in the place of judgement, while we left a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan. We told Noah all the medicines for their diseases with their deceptions so that he could cure (them) by means of the earth's plants. Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine, and the evil spirits were precluded from pursuing Noah's children. He gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons" (VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 2.60).

[71] The analysis demonstrates that, among the Jewish and Manichean materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* shows the closest proximity to the traditions about the garden found in *3 Baruch* 4.

[72] *3 Baruch* 4 appears to be one of the texts where the Adamic tradition plays a prominent role. Scholars have previously noted that Adamic and Enochic/Noachic traditions often compete with each other, offering different interpretations of the origins of evil in the world and the agents responsible for the transgression. In the course of the long-lasting polemics about these matters, Adamic and Enochic traditions often allude reciprocally to the motifs and themes of both. For a detailed discussion of this subject, see Stone, "Axis of History at Qumran," 133–149.

[73] Harlow (*Greek Apocalypse of Baruch*, 59) noted that the author of *3 Baruch* 4 "put the Watchers' myth on its head."

[74] The depiction of the serpent in *3 Baruch* seems to allude to the enormous appetites

2. The author of *3 Baruch* seems to be engaged in anti-Enochic polemics not only with the traditions associated with the *Book of Giants* but also with the Enochic motifs and themes found in the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Jubilees*, and Syncellus. It appears that even the theme of the flooding of the heavenly garden represents an anti-Enochic motif. *Jubilees* 4 depicts Enoch as the one who was translated to the garden of Eden. *Jubilees* 4:23 further tells that because of Enoch "the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment."[75]

3. A substantial part of *3 Baruch* 4 is occupied by the Noachic account, and the Noachic tradition found in *3 Baruch* 4 is closely connected with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the Dead Sea Scroll fragments, and Syncellus. It appears, however, that the Noachic materials found in *3 Baruch* 4 have also undergone the "Adamic" revisions. H.E. Gaylord observes that "a strong typological relation is set up between Adam and Noah, who discovers a piece of the vine through which Adam and Eve sinned washed out of the garden by the receding floodwaters."[76]

---

of the giants; see *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:3 "And he showed me a plain, and there was a serpent on a stone mountain. And it drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass" (Gaylord, "*3 Baruch*," 666).

[75] VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 2.28.

[76] Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 659.

THE MOSES TRADITION

EX 33 ON GOD'S FACE: A LESSON FROM THE ENOCHIC TRADITION

Exodus 33:18–23 depicts Moses who asks the Lord to show him His glory. Instead the Lord agrees to proclaim his name before Moses, telling him that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.

In recent scholarship this prominent motif of Moses' story has become a stumbling block for students of the Hebrew Bible. Currently most biblical scholars agree upon apparent difficulties in the literary-critical analysis of this section of Exodus. M. Noth comments that "a literary-critical analysis of Exodus 33 is probably impossible."[1] B. Childs confirms that there are several fundamental exegetical problems with Exodus 33:18–23. "The most difficult one is to determine the role of this passage in its larger context."[2]

The internal logic of the passage about the Divine face is also problematic. The whole narrative about God's **פנים** in Ex 33 is quite perplexing. Ex 33:11 informs a reader that God would speak to Moses face to face (**פנים אל פנים**) as a man speaks with his friend. A few verses later, in 33:14–15, God promises Moses that His face will go (**פני ילכו**) with him. In the context of these promises and early testimonies about "face-to-face" relationships, it comes as a surprise that in 33:20 the Lord suddenly rejects Moses' request to see His face (**לא תוכל לראת את־פני**).

It is clear that the anthropomorphic tradition about the divine face in Ex 33 has a fragmentary character.[3] It may well contain polemics between the anthropomorphic position of the J source and the Deuteronomic theology of the divine name: instead of the seeing of God's

---

[1] M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 31, n. 114.

[2] B.S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), 595.

[3] A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien placed Ex 33 within the nonsource texts. Cf. A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 263.

face the Lord offers Moses to the hearing of His name.[4] M. Noth observes that Ex 33 can be seen as "a conglomeration of secondary accretions."[5]

The apparent difficulties one encounters in clarifying the concept of the divine face within the context of the known sources of the Pentateuch call for an investigation of the broader biblical and extra-biblical traditions where this motif could be possibly preserved in its extended form. Implicitly linked to the "original" Exodus motif, these later "interpretations" might provide some additional insights which may help us better understand the fragmentary tradition preserved in chapter 33. This study will focus on one of the possible echoes of Ex 33—the theophanic tradition of the divine countenance preserved in the corpus of the Enochic writings.

---

[4] The Old Testament materials reveal complicated polemics for and against anthropomorphic understanding of God. Scholars agree that the anthropomorphic imagery of the Hebrew Bible was "crystallized" in the tradition, known to us as the Priestly source. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 191. Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation. In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle. (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191). Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source, but derives from early sacral conceptions found in the early sourses. In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark, his footstool. In spite of the active promulgation of anthropomorphic concepts in some Old Testament materials, like J, P, and Ezekelian sources, the Hebrew Bible also contains polemics against God's corporeality. Scholars note the sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school to the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source and early anthropomorphic traditions. In their opinion, Deuteronomic school "first initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity and that it was afterwards taken up by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah." (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 198). In contrast to the anthropomorphic imagery of J and P, the Deuteronomic school promulgates anticorporeal theology of "divine name" with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the place where only God's name dwells. On Deuteronomic antianthropomorphism, see T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191–209.

[5] M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 31, n. 114.

The Face of the Lord

The *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*, a Jewish text, apparently written in the first century CE, contains two striking theophanic descriptions involving the motif of the divine face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22 which portrays Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. Enoch recounts:

> I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord (*2 Enoch* 22:1–4, the longer recension).[6]

In chapter 39 Enoch reports this theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to the earth, adding some new details. Although both portrayals demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the divine face with the Lord's anthropomorphic "extent." The following account is drawn from the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*:

> And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are

[6] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 136. The shorter recension of the Slavonic text gives a less elaborated description of the Lord's appearance: "I saw the Lord. His face was strong and very glorious and terrible. Who (is) to give an account of the dimensions of the being of the face of the Lord, strong and very terrible? Or his many-eyed ones and many-voiced ones, and the supremely great throne of the Lord, not made by hands, or those who are in attendance all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, or how unvarying and indescribable and never-silent and glorious is his service. and I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord." Cf. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137. Andersen observes that the absence of the comparison with hot iron in MSS of the shorter recension shows the embarrassment of scribes over this attempt to describe the Lord's appearance. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137.

> the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord,[7] like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun[8] and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord,[9] without measure and without analogy, who has no end… To stand before the King, who will be able to endure the infinite terror of the great burning (*2 Enoch* 39:3–8).[10]

In both theophanic descriptions the notion of the Lord's "face" plays a crucial role. It is not a coincidence that in both of them the "face" is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the divine form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, signaling the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.[11] The hidden כבוד is revealed through this light, which serves as the luminous screen, "the face" of this anthropomorphic extent. *2 Enoch's* theophanies which use the metaphors of light and fire may well be connected with such traditions where the divine "extent" is

---

[7] Slav. **лице Господне.**

[8] The important detail of this description is solar symbolism, which plays an important role in *2 Enoch*. The text often uses solar metaphors in various descriptions of angelic beings; e.g., in chapter 1 where Enoch meets two angels with "faces like the shining sun." Later, during his heavenly journey, Enoch sees "a group of seven angels, brilliant and very glorious with faces more radiant than the radiance of the sun." The images of fire and light are often involved in these solar descriptions of angelic hosts. The text pictures "… glorious and shining and many-eyed stations of the Lord's servants… and of the ranks of powerful fireborn heavenly armies." Andersen rightly observes that "fire and light are fundamental elements in the physics of *2 Enoch*." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 104.

[9] Slav. **обьятие Господне.**

[10] MSS of the longer recension do not demonstrate substantial differences with this description.

[11] April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 104–105.

hidden behind the incandescent "face," which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.

In *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 the "face" is closely associated with the divine "extent" and seems to be understood not simply as a part of the Lord's body (His face) but as a radiant *façade* of His anthropomorphic "form."[12] This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's "form" is reinforced by an additional parallel pair in which Ehoch's face is identified with Enoch's "form":

> You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; but I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks… . And you see the form of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the form (extent) of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end (*2 Enoch* 39:3–6).

The association between the divine face and divine form in *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 alludes to the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18–23 where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with his glorious divine form—God's *Kavod*:[13]

> Then Moses said, "Now show me your glory (כבדך)." And the Lord said, "I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence… but," he said, "you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live."

It is clear that in the biblical passage the impossibility of seeing the Lord's face is understood not simply as the impossibility of seeing the particular part of the Lord but rather as the impossibility of seeing the complete range of His glorious "body." The logic of the whole passage, which employs such terms as God's "face" and God's "back," suggests that the term *panim* refers to the "forefront" of the divine extent. The

---

[12] Gershom Scholem's research on the presence of the שיעור קומה traditions in *2 Enoch* 39 helps to clarify the "anthropomorphic" character of the Lord's "extent" in *2 Enoch*. See his lecture "The Age of *Shiur Komah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen," in G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965), 36–42; *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 20.

[13] The term כבוד can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" כבוד usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe כבוד as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "כבוד," *TDOT*, 7. 22–38.

imagery of the divine face found in Psalms[14] also favors this motif of the identity between the Lord's face and His anthropomorphic "form." For example, in Ps. 17:15 the Lord's face is closely associated with His form or likeness (תמונה):

> As for me, I shall behold your face (פניך)[15] in righteousness; when I awake, I shall be satisfied with beholding your form (תמונתך).[16]

It is evident that all three accounts, Ex 33:18–23, Ps. 17:15, and *2 Enoch* 39:3–6, represent a single tradition in which the divine face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord's anthropomorphic extent.

Apparently, all these accounts deal with the specific anthropomorphic manifestation known as God's *Kavod*.[17] The possibility of such identification is already hinted at in Ex 33 where Moses who asks the Lord to show him His *Kavod* receives the answer that it is impossible for him to see the Lord's "face." The correlation of the divine face with "likeness" (תמונה) in Ps. 17:15 can be also an allusion to *Kavod*, which in Ez 1:28 is described as "the likeness of the glory of the Lord (דמות כבוד יהוה)."

There is another early Mosaic account which correlates the Sinai encounter with *Kavod*. This important tradition, found in the fragments of the drama "Exodus" written by Ezekiel the Tragedian, depicts Moses' experience at Sinai as the vision of God's anthropomorphic *Kavod*:[18]

---

[14] On the Face of God in Psalms see: S. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1983), 49–65; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), 2.35–39; M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS, 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970), 236–237; M. Smith, "Seeing God in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183.

[15] Note also that poetic rhyme תמונתך/פניך further reinforces the correspondence between the face and the form of God in this passage.

[16] Although the passage uses a different terminology, namely, the term תמונה, the identification still has a strong anthropomorphic flavor. The term תמונה can be translated as form, likeness, semblance, or representation.

[17] Contra W. Eichrodt who insists that the *panim* had no connection with the *Kavod*. He argues that the two concepts derive from different roots, and were never combined with one another. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2.38.

[18] P.W. van der Horst observes that Ezekiel the Tragedian's vision of God in human shape seated on the throne is based on the first chapter of the biblical Ezekiel. Cf. P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 24.

I dreamt there was on the summit of mount Sinai
A certain great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) extending up to heaven's cleft,
On which there sat a certain noble man
Wearing a crown and holding a great scepter in his left hand.[19]

W. Meeks observes that this passage may be safely taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE, since it was quoted by Alexander Polyhistor who lived around 80–40 BCE.[20] It means that by the second century BCE Moses' association with *Kavod*, hinted at in Ex 33, was already surrounded by an elaborate imagery, in which the Throne of Glory played a crucial role.

2 Enoch 22 further strengthens this theophanic pattern in which the encounter with the Divine Face is understood as the vision of God's throne. The text gives a number of evidences which prove that the anthropomorphic "extent," identified with the divine face, indeed represents His *Kavod*. The theophany of the divine countenance in the Slavonic apocalypse is surrounded by a peculiar *Kavod* imagery, which plays a prominent role in the Ezekelian account. The following parallels are noteworthy:

1. The theophany of the divine face took place in the highest of the heaven.[21] The highest of the heaven is a traditional place of God's Throne, the abode of His Glory. A later account found in *3 Enoch* tells us that "In *ʿArabot* there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of *ʿArabot* would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance… ."[22]

2. The theophanic description in *2 Enoch* 22 refers to "His many-eyed ones,"[23] alluding to **האופנים**, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who in Ezekiel 1:18 are described as the angelic beings "full of eyes (**מלאת עינים**)."

---

[19] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (4 vols.; Texts and Translations, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 2.363.

[20] W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 149. Cf. also Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.308–312.

[21] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 136–137.

[22] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 305.

[23] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137.

3. A reference to the "many-voiced ones" probably alludes to choirs of angelic hosts surrounding the Throne.

4. Finally, in *2 Enoch* 22 there is a direct reference to the throne of the Lord, which occupies a central place in the theophanic description, and is pictured as "supremely great and not made by hands."[24] The Throne of Glory is surrounded by the armies of the angelic hosts, cherubim and the seraphim, with "their never-silent singing."[25]

Moses' Face

Previous research shows that the correlation between God's face and his luminous form (his glorious *Kavod*) was already implicitly articulated in Ex 33. The Enochic theophany found in *2 Enoch* further strengthens this connection, giving a theophanic description of the Lord's face as his terrifying "extent" which emits light and fire.

The important detail of these two accounts is the "danger motif"—the warnings about the peril of seeing the Deity. Both of them contain specific references to the harmful effect this theophanic experience has on the mortals who dare to behold the Divine face. In Ex 33:20 the Lord warns Moses about the danger of seeing His face: "You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live." The motif of peril is further reinforced by the Lord's instructions in 33:22 where he commands Moses to hide himself into a cleft in the rock and promises to protect the prophet with His hands.

The "danger motif" also looms large in *2 Enoch*. In *2 Enoch* 39, immediately after his description of the theophany of the face, Enoch gives warning to his children about the danger of this theophanic experience:

> Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies, [the regulator of the living and of the dead]. Who can endure that endless misery? (*2 Enoch* 39:8).[26]

---

[24] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137.
[25] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137.
[26] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 164.

The "danger motif" in Ex 33 and in *2 Enoch* implicitly suggests that both of these accounts support the idea that the human being actually can see the face of God. M. Weinfeld argues that the warning about the danger of seeing the Deity usually affirms the possibility of such an experience. In his observations about antianthropomorphic tendencies of Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah, he points to the fact that these texts demonstrate a lack of usual warnings about the danger of seeing the Deity found in pre-Deuteronomic books. He concludes that it happened because the Deuteronomic school cannot conceive of the possibility of seeing the Deity.[27]

The possibility of theophany hinted at in *2 Enoch* and Ex 33 might suggest that Exodus' account implicitly asserts that Moses could see the divine form.[28] The distinctive details in the depiction of Moses' face in Ex 34 may further support this conclusion. But before we explore this motif, let us again return to the narrative of *2 Enoch*.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine face had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. The important detail here is that the luminous transformation of Enoch takes place in front of the radiant "face" of the Lord. In 22:6 Enoch reports that he was lifted up and brought before the Lord's face by archangel Michael. The Lord decides to appoint Enoch as **שר הפנים**, the Prince of the Divine Presence: "Let Enoch come up and stand in front of my face forever."[29] Further, the Lord commanded archangel Michael to remove Enoch from earthly clothing, anoint him with the delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of the Lord's glory (22:8–9).[30] The text describes the actions of Michael, who anoints Enoch with the delightful oil and clothes him. The symbolism of light permeates the whole scene; the oil emanates the rays of the glittering sun "greater than the greatest light."[31] At the end of this procedure, Enoch "had

---

[27] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 207.

[28] Another "Mosaic" account attributed to J, openly articulates this possibility: "With him (Moses) I speak mouth to mouth (**פה אל פה**), clearly and not in riddles; he sees the form (**ותמנת**) of the Lord (Num 12:8)."

[29] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[30] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[31] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 138. Jarl Fossum provides a number of allusions to the theme of "shining oil" in *2 Enoch*. Cf. J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 84.

become like one of the glorious ones,[32] and there was no observable difference."[33]

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face on the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs us that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun…"[34] Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would be able to look at his face.[35] This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.[36]

References to the shining countenance of a visionary found in *2 Enoch* return us again to the Exodus story. Ex 34:29–35 portrays Moses after his encounter with the Lord.[37] The passage tells that "when Moses came down from Mount Sinai … he was not aware that his face was radiant, because he had spoken with the Lord." The strange logic of the last sentence, which points to anambiguous connection between the speech of the Lord as a cause of Moses' glowing face can be

---

[32] Andersen observes that "this motif (Enoch's transformation into the glorious angel) seems to have been influenced by the legend of Moses, whose shining face was a reflection of God's magnificent glory." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[33] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[34] Andersen, 160.

[35] Andersen, 160.

[36] About possible Mesopotamian provenance of this motif cf.: M. Haran, "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29–35; Ps. 69:32; Hab 3:4]," *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOP, 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), 159–173; W. Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face—Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375–386.

[37] On Moses' traditions see: R. Bloch, "Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition," in *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963), 95–171; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup, 57; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1988); S. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79–104; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History* (New York: Seabury, 1980).

explained by the Enochic theophanic account where "the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out."[38]

These parallels between the later Enochic text and the biblical Mosaic account are not inappropriate. As will be demonstrated later, the connection between the Enochic and Mosaic accounts has quite ancient roots. Evidences of the early link between Enoch and Moses includes the already mentioned drama of Ezekiel the Tragedian, which was apparently written during the second century BCE.[39]

W. Meeks[40] and P.W. van der Horst[41] observe that the depiction of Moses in the drama of Ezekiel the Tragedian bears some similarities to Enoch's figure in the Enochic traditions. They note a number of remarkable allusions in the drama to the Enochic motifs and themes. These allusions include the following points:

1. Moses's account is depicted as his dream vision in a fashion similar to Enoch's dreams in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*.
2. In the text Moses is "elevated" by God, who gives him the throne, the royal diadem,[42] and the scepter.
3. God appointed Moses as an eschatological judge of humankind able to see "things present, past and future"[43]—the traditional role of Enoch found already in early Enochic booklets.
4. Moses is an "expert" in "a variety of things," including cosmological and astronomical information:

> I beheld the entire circled earth
> Both beneath the earth and above the heaven,
> And a host of stars fell on its knees before me;
> I numbered them all,
> They passed before me like a squadron of soldiers.[44]

---

[38] Andersen, 163.

[39] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.312.

[40] Meeks, 147.

[41] P.W. van der Horst, 21–29.

[42] The crowning of Enoch-Metatron became a prominent leitmotif in later Enochic tradition, especially, in *3 Enoch*. W. Meeks observes that the enthronement of Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch* "betrays interesting similarities to Moses' traditions." Meeks, 207. See also van der Horst who observes that "like Moses, Enoch is assigned a cosmic and divine function that involves the wearing of regalia." P.W. van der Horst, 25.

[43] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.367.

[44] C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.365.

This preoccupation with various meteorological, astronomical and eschatological "secrets" are typical duties of the elevated Enoch which are here transferred to Moses apparently for the first time.[45]

5. Finally, the motif of assigning the seat/throne is a peculiar feature of Enochic literature where Enoch-Metatron is depicted as a scribe[46] who has a seat (later a throne) in the heavenly realm.[47] *2 Enoch* 23:4 pictures the angel Vereveil who commands Enoch to sit down. "You sit down;[48] write everything…" And Enoch said, "And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately" (23:6).[49] The theme of Enoch-Metatron's seat became a prominent motif in rabbinic tradition, where according to *b*. Hag. 15a, the privilege of "sitting" beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe": for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

The tacit links between Enoch and Moses found in the early Enochic theophanic tradition later become openly articulated in rabbinic literature. In this later enunciation, as in the initial encounters, the familiar theophanic motif from the Exodus story again plays a crucial role. From *3 Enoch* we learn that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face once was

---

[45] R.H. Charles argued that this transition of Enoch's function to Moses first was made in *2 Apoc. Bar.*, where God shows Moses "the measures of the fire, also the depths of the abyss, and the weight of the winds, and the number of the drops of rain." *APOT*, 2.514.

[46] In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 2.173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as "the scribe of distinction" ספר פרשא. Cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 261–262 and 305. In the *Book of Jubilees* Enoch is attested as "the first of mankind … who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky…" J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 2.25–26.

[47] P.W. van der Horst also stresses unique features of Moses' enthronement in Ezekiel the Tragedian, which depart from Enochic and Merkabah imagery. He observes that "in Moses' vision, there is only one throne, God's. And Moses is requested to be seated on it, not at God's side but all alone. God leaves his throne. This scene is unique in early Jewish literature and certainly implies a deification of Moses." van der Horst, 25.

[48] Slav. **сѣди.**

[49] Andersen, 141.

transformed into fire,[50] who is now the one[51] who tells Moses about his shining visage: "At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to Moses, Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other."[52]

Conclusion

The foregoing research has examined some extrabiblical materials related to the motif of the divine face found in Ex 33. The investigation has shown that the evolution of this motif in later traditions is dependent on the Enoch-Moses *gestalt*, which plays a prominent role in the Enochic theophanies of the divine face. This research, however, would not be complete without mentioning another important source which is also related to the traditions about the patriarch Enoch and the prophet Moses. This source is the priestly editor of the Pentateuch.

Much attention has been devoted to the peculiar interest of the priestly editor in anthropomorphic descriptions of the Deity.[53] M. Weinfeld and T. Mettinger show that the Priestly source played a crucial role

---

[50] *3 Enoch* 15:1 depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch-Metatron: "When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Schekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." Alexander, 267.

[51] Scholars observe that in Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified with the Face of God. Cf.: A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJ, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999), 329; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988), 424–425.

[52] *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Cf. Alexander, 304.

[53] On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960), 31–38; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939), 75–85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); E. Jacob, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1955), 30ff.; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8; Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990), 87–590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982).

in promoting biblical theophanic traditions. In these traditions Moses' figure has occupied an important place.[54]

The Priestly source also was the locus where the enigmatic figure of Enoch for the first time appeared in its esoteric complexity,[55] indicating that the priestly author was cognizant of the broader Enochic developments. Some scholars believe that perhaps it is "to some such developed Enoch tradition the author of Genesis is making reference when he emits his cryptic statements about Enoch in Genesis 5:22–24."[56]

Students of the Enochic tradition are now aware that the priestly editor was familiar with the peculiar Mesopotamian traditions[57] which constituted a conceptual framework for Enoch's figure.[58]

---

[54] T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 191–209.

[55] The traditions about Enoch are different in J and P. For the discussion of the differences, see J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 23–51; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 40–53.

[56] M. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origin," *JSJ* 19 (1988) 162.

[57] On the Mesopotamian traditions behind the Enoch's figure, see H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung," in Eberhard Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols., Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902–1903), 2.530–543; H.L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*.

[58] Important witnesses to these traditions include the various versions of the so-called Sumerian antediluvian King List, the materials which dated from 1500 BCE to 165 BCE The List demonstrates a number of similarities with the genealogy of Genesis 5. One of its interesting details is that Mesopotamian kings, as well as patriarchs from Genesis' account, had extraordinary long reigns, ranging from 3,600 to 72,000 years. A second important parallel is that two versions of the List give ten kings, the last of whom is designated as the hero of the flood. It demonstrates a close resemblance to the role of Noah who occupies the tenth place in the list of Genesis 5. J. VanderKam notes that "in the literature on Genesis 5 there is a well established tradition which holds that P modeled his pre-flood genealogy on a Mesopotamian list of antediluvian kings, the so-called Sumerian King List." VanderKam, 26. An important character of the Sumerian King list is Enmeduranki (Enmeduranna), the king of Sippar, the city of the sun-god Šamaš. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. Moreover, in other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations which demonstrate remarkable similarities with Enoch's story. J. VanderKam's research shows that the priestly author was aware of these broader Mesopotamian traditions which served as a prototype for Enoch's figure, whose symbolical age of 365 years reflects the link between the patriarch

In these Mesopotamian traditions a prototype of Enoch, Enmeduranki, is portrayed as a "translated" figure, the one "who sat in the presence (*maḫar*)[59] of Šamaš and Adad, the divine adjudicators."[60] This reference to Enmeduranki's access to the glorious presence/face of the solar deity[61] indicates that the later role of Enoch as *Sar ha-Panim*, the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face,[62] was already present in its rudimentary form in the Mesopotamian traditions known to the priestly editor.

In the light of these observations the idea that Ex 33 could actually contain the original Enochic motif is not inappropriate. The implicit link between the Enochic account of the divine Presence and the Mosaic account of the divine *panim* may well reflect the conceptual world of the priestly editor, who often "has expressed his acquaintance with a fairly broad range of Mesopotamian traditions in remarkably few words."[63]

---

and the solar cult of Šamaš. VanderKam concludes that "the biblical image of Enoch is based on the Mesopotamian picture of Enmeduranki." VanderKam, 50.

[59] In another text about Enmeduranki the same motif of the divine presence can be found: "…he may approach the presence (*maḫar*) of Šamaš and Adad…" W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967) 132.

[60] W.G. Lambert, 128 and 130.

[61] On Mesopotamian solar symbolism and its influence on biblical concepts, including the concept of the divine *panim* cf. A. Caquot, "La Divinité Solaire Ougaritique," *Syria* 36 (1959) 90–101; B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils* (WMANT, 59; Neukirchen–Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 1.105ff.; B. Langer, *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60:1–3.19f.* (Österreichische biblische Studien, 7; Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholische Bibelwerk, 1989); W. Smelik, "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism," *JSJ* 26 (1995) 122–144; M. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990); M. Smith, "The Near Eastern Background of Solar Language for Yahweh," *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29–39; H.P. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 66; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

[62] Some scholars argue that the biblical concept of the divine face also has Mesopotamian roots. M. Fishbane and M. Smith show that the language of the Lord's shining face was part of Israel's inheritance from ancient Near Eastern culture. Cf. M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121; M. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183. Fishbane stresses that "the various and abundant use of such imagery in ancient Near Eastern literature, particularly from Mesopotamia where it recurs in a wide range of genres, suggests that ancient Israel absorbed such imagery as part and parcel of its rich patrimony." Fishbane, 116.

[63] VanderKam, 50.

VESTED WITH ADAM'S GLORY: MOSES AS THE LUMINOUS COUNTERPART OF ADAM IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE MACARIAN HOMILIES

Two Luminaries

In the group of the Dead Sea Scrolls fragments known under the title the *Words of the Luminaries* (*4Q504*),[1] the following passage about the glory of Adam in the Garden of Eden can be found:

> … [… Adam,] our [fat]her, *you fashioned in the image of [your] glory* (**יצרתה בדמות כבוד** […] **כה**) […] [… the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge […] [… in the gard]en of Eden, which you had planted. You made [him] govern […] […] and so that he would walk in a glorious land… […] […] he kept. And you imposed on him not to tu[rn away…] […] he is flesh, and to dust […] …[2]

---

[1] On the *Words of Luminaries*, see M. Baillet, "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4; 'Les Paroles des Luminaires,'" *Revue Biblique* 67 (1961) 195–250; *idem*, "Remarques sur l'édition des Paroles des Luminaires," *RevQ* 5 (1964) 23–42; *idem*, *Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482–520)* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982); E. Glickler Chazon, *"Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam): A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications* (Ph.D. dissertation, Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991); *idem*, "4QDibHam: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1991–1992) 447–455; *idem*, "'Dibre Hammêorot': Prayer for the Sixth Day (4Q504 1–2 v–vi)," *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (eds. M. Kiley *et al.*; London, New York: Routledge, 1997), 23–27; C.A. Evans, "Aspect of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels," *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Concepts* (ed. J.M. Scott; JSJSup., 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 308–309; D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1988), 59–94; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill, 1997), 2.1008–1019; K.G. Kuhn, "Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 163–234; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ, 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994); D.T. Olson, "Words of the Lights (4Q504–4Q506)," *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation. Vol. 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth and H.W.L. Rietz; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 107–153; É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future* (2 vols.; Paris, 1993), 2.563–568.

[2] García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.1008–1009.

Later in *4Q504*, this tradition about Adam's former glory follows with a reference to the luminosity bestowed on another human body—the glorious face of Moses at his encounter with the Lord at Sinai:

> … […Re]member, please, that all of us are your people. You have lifted us wonderfully [upon the wings of] eagles and you have brought us to you. And like the eagle which watches its nest, circles [over its chicks,] stretches its wings, takes one and carries it upon [its pinions] […] we remain aloof and one does not count us among the nations. And […] […] You are in our midst, in the column of fire and in the cloud […] […] your [hol]y […] walks in front of us, *and your glory is in [our] midst* (וכבודכה בתוכ[נו]) […] […] *the face of Moses* (פני מושה), [your] serv[ant]…[3]

Two details are intriguing in these descriptions. First, the author of *4Q504* appears to be familiar with the lore about the glorious garments of Adam, the tradition according to which first humans had luminous attires in Eden before their transgression.

Second, the author seems to draw parallels between the glory of Adam and the glory of Moses' face.[4] The luminous face of the prophet might represent in this text an alternative to the lost luminosity of Adam and serve as a new symbol of God's glory once again manifested in the human body. It appears, therefore, that in *4Q504*, traditions about Adam's glory and Moses' glory are creatively juxtaposed

---

[3] García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.1008–1009.

[4] On non-biblical Mosaic traditions, see: R. Bloch, "Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," in: *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance* (ed. H. Cazelles; Tounai, New York: Desclée, 1955), 93–167; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup., 57; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988); S.J. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79–104; C.R. Holladay, "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBLSP* (1976) 447–452; P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 21–29; *idem*, "Some Notes on the Exagoge of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 364–365; L. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 58ff.; H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983); K. Kuiper, "Le poète juif Ezéchiel," *Revue des études juives* 46 (1903) 174ff.; W.A. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; SHR, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 354–371; *idem*, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147; A. Schalit, *Untersuchungen zur Assumptio Mosis* (ALGHJ, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1989); J.P. Schultz, "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law," *JQR* 61 (1970–1971) 282–307; J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVT, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993); R. van de Water, "Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?" *JSP* 21 (2000) 59–69.

with each other. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the Qumran document does not allow us to grasp the full scope and intentions of the author(s) of *4Q504* in making such a juxtaposition. To understand this juxtaposition better, research must proceed to other sources where the association between the glory of Adam and Moses was made more explicit. One of such sources includes the Macarian Homilies, where the author vividly accentuates this association. However, before our research proceeds to a detailed analysis of the Adam/Moses connection in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian homilies, a short introduction to the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian materials about the glorious garments of Adam and the glorious face of Moses is needed.

The Background: The Garments of Light

The Biblical passages found in Gen 1:26–27 and Gen 3:21 represent two pivotal starting points for the subsequent Jewish and Christian reflections on the glorious garments of Adam and Eve. Gen 1:26 describes the creation of human being(s) after the likeness (דמות) of the image (צלם) of God. It is noteworthy that Gen 1:26–27 refers to the צלם (*tselem*) of Adam, the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.[5] The particular interest in Gen 1:26 is that Adam's *tselem* was created after God's own *tselem* (בצלמנו) (literally "in our *tselem*"), being a luminous "imitation" of the glorious *tselem* of God. Some scholars argue that the likeness that Adam and God shared was not physicality—in the usual sense of having a body—but rather luminescence.[6]

The Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, also attest to the prelapsarian luminosity of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. The Biblical background for such traditions includes the passage

[5] For discussions about the luminous body of Adam, see: David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299–314; S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982), 11–40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 141; Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195; B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255.

[6] Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body," 303.

from Gen 3:21, where "the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin and clothed them." The targumic traditions, both Palestinian[7] and Babylonian,[8] read, instead of "garments of skin," "garments of glory." This targumic interpretation is reinforced by rabbinic sources. One of them can be found in *Genesis Rabbah* 20:12, which tells that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" (כתנות אור) instead of "garments of skin" (כתנות עור): "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light: this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top.'"[9]

It is usually understood that Gen 3:21 refers to God clothing Adam and Eve's nakedness after the Fall. S. Brock, however, argues that sufficient evidence exist to suggest that there also was another way of understanding the time reference of Gen 3:21. According to this alternative understanding the verbs are to be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve at their creation before the Fall.[10]

It is noteworthy that in the later Jewish and Samaritan sources, the story about Adam's luminous garments is often mentioned in conjunction with Moses' story. In these materials, Moses is often depicted as a luminous counterpart of Adam.

---

[7] In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 the following tradition can be found: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; AB, 1B; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992), 29. Targum Neofiti on Gen 3:21 unveils the similar tradition: "And the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife *garments of glory* (לבושין דיקר), for the skin of their flesh, and he clothed them." *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; AB, 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 62–63; A. Díez Macho, *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968) 1.19. The Fragmentary Targum on Gen 3:21 also uses the imagery of the glorious garments: "And He made: And the memra of the Lord God created for Adam and his wife *precious garments* (לבושין דיקר) [for] the skin of their flesh, and He clothed them." M.I. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), 1.46; 2.7.

[8] Targum Onqelos on Gen 3:21 reads: "And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife *garments of honor for the skin of their flesh* (לבושין דיקר על משך בסרהון), and He clothed them." *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (tr. B. Grossfeld; The Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), 46; *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (5 vols.; ed. A. Sperber; Leiden: Brill, 1959), 1.5.

[9] Cf. H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1939), 1. 171.

[10] Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," 14.

Jarl Fossum and April De Conick successfully demonstrated the importance of the Samaritan materials for understanding the connection between the "glories" of Adam and Moses. The Samaritan texts insist that when Moses ascended to Mount Sinai, he received the image of God which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden.[11] According to *Memar Marqah*, Moses was endowed with the identical glorious body as Adam.[12] *Memar Marqah* 5.4 tells us that: "He [Moses] was vested with the form which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden; and his face shone up to the day of his death."[13]

The Adam/Moses connection also looms large in the rabbinic sources. Alon Goshen Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the image (*tselem*) is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials."[14]

Deuteronomy Rabbah 11.3 offers important witness to the Adam/Moses connection. It includes the following passage in which two "luminaries" argue whose glory is the greatest:

> Adam said to Moses: "I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God." Whence this? For it is said, "and God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: "I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me." Whence? For it is said: "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. 34,7).[15]

Goshen Gottstein draws attention to another significant midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4, in which Moses poses Adam's luminous counterpart. The tradition tells that

> …in the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt… In the beginning: "and God created man in his image," and in the desert: "and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone."[16]

---

[11] J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985), 93; A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 159.

[12] Fossum, *The Name of God*, 94.

[13] J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah* (BZAW, 83; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963), 209.

[14] Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 182.

[15] H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.173.

[16] Cf. A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann. 1967), 3.168.

It is also remarkable that later rabbinic materials often speak of the luminosity of Adam's face,[17] the feature that might point to the influence of the Adam–Moses connection. Thus, as an example, in *Leviticus Rabbah* 20.2, the following passage can be found:

> Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the *brightness of his face*! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind.[18]

Genesis Rabbah 11 also focuses, not on Adam's luminous garments, but rather on his glorious face:

> Adam's glory did not abide the night with him. What is the proof? But Adam passeth not the night in glory (Ps. XLIX, 13). The Rabbis maintain: His glory abode with him, but at the termination of the Sabbath He deprived him of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, Thou changest *his countenance*, and sendest him away (Job XIV, 20).[19]

Despite the importance of these late rabbinic passages linking the luminosity of Adam's body and Moses' face, the chronological boundaries of these evidences are difficult to establish. Rabbinic attestations to the Adam–Moses connection are also very succinct and sometimes lack any systematic development.

Much more extensive expositions of the traditions about Moses as the heavenly counterpart of Adam can be found in the writings of the fourth century Christian author, the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius.

---

[17] According to Jewish sources, the image of God was reflected especially in the radiance of Adam's face. See: Fossum, *The Name of God*, 94; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1:26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen* (FRLANT, 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).

[18] H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah*, 4.252.

[19] H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah*, 1.81.

Adam and Moses in the Macarian Homilies

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the Adam–Moses "glory" typologies for the theological enterprise of the Macarian Homilies.[20] The symbolism of the divine light seems to stay at the center of the theological world of the Syrian father.[21] Adam's luminosity in the Garden and Christ's luminosity at Mount Tabor serve for Pseudo-Macarius as important landmarks of the eschatological *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*. In dealing with these stories of the fall and the restoration of the divine light in human nature, Macarian writings also employ another important traditional symbol of the manifestation of the divine glory in humans—Moses' luminous face. In his employment of the Adam–Moses connection, the author of the Macarian Homilies reveals profound knowledge of the Jewish and Christian esoteric traditions about the glorious manifestations of Adam and Moses.

The story of Adam serves for the homilist as the starting point of his theology of the divine light. Thus, from the homily II.12[22] the reader

---

[20] This feature of the Macarian Homilies serves as additional proof of the close relationship between Pseudo-Macarius and the various Syriac developments in which the theme of Adam's garments plays an important theological role. S. Brock notes the extensive usage of the "clothing" metaphors in the Syriac tradition. He shows that this imagery is closely connected with Adam Christology: "… the first Adam loses the robe of glory at the Fall; the second Adam puts on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the robe of glory…." Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," 16.

[21] The traditions about the glorious garments of Adam and Eve were widespread in the Syriac sources. [For a detailed discussion of this subject, see: De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, 157–172; Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," 11–38]. It is possible that the early Syrian authors gained access to such traditions through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. The Macarian Homilies, which were connected with the Syrian milieu, demonstrate that their author was exposed to a great variety of the Jewish and Christian traditions about the luminous garments of the first humans.

[22] There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; ed. H. Berthold, GCS; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1973). Collection II appeared in: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964). Collection III appeared in *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Simeon aus Typus III* (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961) and *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homélies propres à la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez; SC, 275; Paris: Cerf, 1980). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following Arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

learns that "Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ᾽ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance" (II.12.1).[23] Further, another important passage in the same homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (II.12.8).[24] The homily shows a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created after the image and likeness of God, and Adam's "very image itself," he speaks of them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about the *tselem* of Adam—the luminous image of God's glory according to which the first human being was created. The Macarian association of Adam's garments and his creation after the luminous image of God points us again to the Qumran passage from *4Q504*, where Adam is depicted as the one who was "fashioned" in the image of God's glory. It should be noted that besides this reference to "image," both texts entertain several other parallels that reveal similarities between the Adamic story in the Macarian Homilies and the Adamic traditions at Qumran.

First, the Qumran Adamic account in *4Q504* 8 is distinctive in that it connects Adam's glorious state[25] with his ability to exercise dominion[26] over the rest of creation. *4Q504* 8 reads:

---

[23] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 97; H. Dörries *et al.*, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 107–108.

[24] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 100.

[25] Cf. *2 Enoch* 30:11–12 (the longer recension): "And on the earth I assigned him to be a second angel, honored and great and glorious. And I assigned him to be a king, to reign on the earth, and to have my wisdom." F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.152.

[26] E. Glickler Chazon, "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays* (eds. J. Frishman and L. van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca, 5; Lovain: Peeters, 1997), 15.

> … [… Adam,] our [fat]her, *you fashioned in the image of [your] glory* …You made [him] *govern* […] […] and so that he would walk in a glorious land …[27]

Macarian writings also employ the same juxtaposition by linking Adam's glory with his capacity to exercise power over the created order by giving names to various things.[28] The Homily II.12.6 tells us that:

> …As long as the Word of God was with him, he [Adam] possessed everything. For the Word himself was his inheritance, his covering, and *a glory* that was his defense (Is 4:5). He was his teaching. For *he taught him how to give names to all things*: "Give this name of heaven, that the sun; this the moon; that earth; this a bird; that a beast; that a tree." As he was instructed, so he named them.[29]

A second important detail that connects the Adamic tradition at Qumran with Macarian writings is that the luminous image (*tselem*) of Adam in the Macarian Homilies is termed as "the full heavenly inheritance."[30] In II.12.1, it is also associated with a very valuable estate:

> …he lost the very image itself in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance (κληρονομία). Take the example of a coin bearing the image of the king. If it were mixed with a false alloy and lost its gold content, the image also would lose its value. Such, indeed, happened to Adam. A very great richness and inheritance was prepared for him. It was as though there were a large estate and it possessed many sources of income. It had a fruitful vineyard; there were fertile fields, flocks, gold and silver. Such was the vessel of Adam before his disobedience like a very valuable estate.[31]

The terminology found in this Macarian passage seems to allude to the Qumran Adamic materials, which also refer to Adam's "inheritance." Thus, the Qumran Pesher on Psalms (*4Q171*) contains a reference to the inheritance of Adam (נחלת אדם) which the Israelites will have in the future:

> …those who have returned from the wilderness, who will live for a thousand generations, in salva[tio]n; for them there is all the inheritance of Adam (נחלת אדם), and for their descendants for ever…[32]

---

[27] García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.1009.

[28] Cf. also Gen 1:26.

[29] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 99.

[30] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 97.

[31] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 97.

[32] 4Q171 3:1–2. García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.345.

In previous studies, scholars[33] noted that this passage from *4Q171* seems to refer to an eschatological period characterized in part by a reversal of the Adamic curse and the restoration of the glory[34] of Adam.[35]

It is important to note that the Macarian passage links the inheritance with the large estate which includes a vineyard. The reference to the vineyard is intriguing since in *4Q171* the term, the "inheritance" of Adam, is closely associated with the Temple[36] and the Temple mountain.[37]

The foregoing analysis shows that the theme of Adam's heavenly garments plays an important role in the theological universe of the Macarian Homilies. The homilist, however, does not follow blindly these ancient traditions, but, incorporates them into the fabric of the Christian story. The Adamic narrative, therefore, represents an essential part of the Macarian "glory" Christology, where the lost luminous garment of the First Adam has to be restored by the glory of the Second Adam, Christ. The Second Adam thus must put on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the lost clothes of the divine light, which now has to be acquired by the believers at their resurrection.

However, in Macarian writings this "glory" Christology is not simply confined to the Adam–Christ dichotomy but includes a third important element, namely, the story of Moses, whose glorious face serves as the *prototype* for the future glory of Christ at the Transfiguration.[38] The radiance of the patriarch's face remains in the Macarian Homilies to be the mediating point between the former glory of Adam lost in the Paradise

---

[33] M.O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991–1992) 128.

[34] Cf. *CD* 3:20 "Those who remain steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam (וכל כבוד אדם) is for them." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.555.

[35] M. Wise observes that this description in *4Q171* "jibes completely with the concept of כבוד אדם in *CD*." Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," 128.

[36] On the identification of Eden with the Sanctuary, see: G.J. Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community Without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT, 118; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999), 285–299.

[37] *4Q171* 3:11 "…they will inherit the high mountain of Isra[el and] delight [in his] holy [mou]ntain." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.345.

[38] Here again Macarius draws on the established Christian tradition which can be traced to the Pauline writings (esp. 2Cor 3), where the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ are interconnected.

and the future glory of Christ, which will eventually be manifested in the resurrected bodies of the saints. Thus, in the Homily II.5.10–11, Macarius describes Moses' glorious face as the prototype of the future glory:

> …For the blessed Moses provided us with *a certain type* (τὸν τύπον) through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze. This type anticipates how in the resurrection of the just the body of the saints will be glorified with a glory which even now the souls of the saintly and faithful people are deemed worthy to possess within, in the indwelling of the inner man … .[39]

In his presentation of the shining appearance of Moses, the homilist, however, makes a clear distinction between the glory of Moses at Sinai and the glory of Christ at the Transfiguration. Moses' glory is only a "prototype" of God's "true" glory. Macarius' understanding of Moses' glory as the prototype (τύπος) or the figure of the "true glory" is observable, for example, in the Homily II.47.1:

> …The glory of Moses which he received on his countenance was *a figure of the true glory* (τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς δόξης). Just as the Jews were unable "to look steadfastly upon the face of Moses" (2 Cor 3:7), so now Christians receive that glory of light in their souls, and the darkness, not bearing the splendor of the light, is blinded and is put to fight.[40]

Another feature of Moses' glorification is that Moses' luminous face was only "covered" with God's glory in the same way as the luminous garments covered the body of the first humans. According to Macarius, Moses' luminosity was not able to penetrate human nature and remove the inner garments of darkness bestowed by the devil on the human heart.[41] In II.32.4, the Syrian father affirms that:

---

[39] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74; Dörries, 62. The Homily II.5.11 repeats the same idea again: "In a double way, therefore, the blessed Moses shows us what glory true Christians will receive in the resurrection: namely, the glory of light and the spiritual delights of Spirit which even now they are deemed worthy to possess interiorly." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74.

[40] Homily II.47.1. Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 232; Dörries, 304.

[41] The Macarian motif of the garments of darkness bestowed by Satan on the first humans brings us to the connection between the Macarian Homilies and the targumic traditions. It has been mentioned previously that the Syrian authors might have acquired their knowledge of the Jewish aggadic traditions about the luminosity of the garments of Adam and Eve via their familiarity with the targumic texts. Some

> …Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.[42]

For Macarius, only the glory of Christ is able to remove the attire of darkness and "heal" the human heart. It is, therefore, observable that for the Syrian father the glory of Moses shows a greater typological affinity to the glory of Adam[43] than to the glory of Christ.

A decisive feature of the Macarian Homilies is that the homilist often emphasizes the connection between the luminosity of Adam's heavenly attire lost in the Paradise and the luminosity of Moses' face acquired on Mount Sinai. In the Macarian Homilies, the motif of Moses' glorious face seems to serve as a sign of the partial restoration of the former

---

features of Adam's story found in the Macarian Homilies point in this direction. For example, the Homily II.1.7 tells that when "… Adam violated the command of God and obeyed the deceitful serpent he sold himself to the devil and that evil one put on Adam's soul as his garment—that most beautiful creature that God had fashioned according to his own image…." [Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 41]. This motif of Adam being clothed with the evil one as his garment seems to allude to the targumic tradition which attests to the fact that God made garments for Adam and Eve from the skin which the serpent had cast off. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 tells that: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." [*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; AB, 1B; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 29]. It seems, however, that the author of the Macarian Homilies substantially edits this targumic tradition. In the Macarian Homilies, the garments of the devil become the attire of darkness in contrast to the Palestinian Targum, where they are depicted as the garments of light. On the garments of darkness, cf. also the Homily II.30.7: "In that day when Adam fell, God came walking in the garden. He wept, so to speak, seeing Adam and he said: 'After such good things, what evils you have chosen! After such glory, what shame you now bear! What darkness are you now! What ugly form you are! What corruption! From such light, what darkness has covered you!' When Adam fell and was dead in the eyes of God, the Creator wept over him. The angels, all the powers, the heavens, the earth and all creatures bewailed his death and fall. For they saw him, who had been given to them as their king, now become a servant of an opposing and evil power. Therefore, darkness became the garment of his soul, a bitter and evil darkness, for he was made a subject of the prince of darkness." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 192–193.

[42] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 198.

[43] Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14: "I think that the glorified face of Moses was a type (τύπος) and teaching of the first Adam, formed by the hands of God, which death saw and was wounded by it, not being able to look on it, and fearing that its kingdom would be dissolved and destroyed—which, with the Lord, did in fact occur." Alexander Golitzin, *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I, 3* (forthcoming); *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)*, 1.9. I am thankful to Father Alexander Golitzin for letting me make use of his forthcoming English translation of the Macarian Homilies from Collection I.

glory of Adam,[44] the glorious garment of light in which Adam and Eve were clothed in the Garden of Eden before their transgression. Moses' glorious face is, therefore, viewed by the homilist as the counterpart of the glorious garment of Adam. The conflation of the two "glories," lost and acquired, is observable, for instance, in the Homily II.12. After the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius sets before the reader the example of Moses as the one who "had a glory shining on his countenance."[45]

The Healing Motif

The employment of the Adam/Moses connection in the Qumran materials does not seem to be confined solely to *4Q504*. There is another important document which appears to entertain a similar connection. In the Qumran fragment *4Q374*, also known as the *Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition*,[46] the portentous clause can be found which connects Moses' shining countenance[47] at the Sinai encounter[48] with

[44] Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14 "Now, I think that when the enemy saw the original glory of Adam on the face of Moses, he was wounded because [he understood that] his kingdom was going to be taken away." Alexander Golitzin, *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I, 3* (forthcoming).

[45] "…Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food." (II.12.14). Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102; Dörries, 114.

[46] On *4Q374*, see: C. Fletcher-Louis, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996) 236–252; C.A. Newsom, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition," *The Dead Sea Scroll: Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant, and U. Rappaport; STDJ, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 40–52. On Moses pseudepigrapha in the DSS, see: J. Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSS, 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 221–256.

[47] On the luminosity of the Moses face, see: M. Haran, "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29–35; Ps. 69:32; Hab 3:4]," *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOP, 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), 159–173; W. Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face—Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375–386.

[48] Crispin Fletcher-Louis rightly observes that there is ample evidence that the passage from *4Q374* was concerned with the revelation at Sinai. Cf. Fletcher-Louis,

the motif of healing. The passage unveils the following tradition: "[But] he (Moses) had pity with […] and when he let his face shine for them *for healing* (**למרפא**), they strengthened [their] hearts again…"[49]

In this passage, as in *4Q504*, God's glory is described as manifested through Moses' shining face. It appears that the passage is related to the ongoing discussion about the luminosity of Moses and Adam. Here again, as in the case of *4Q504*, the evidence found in the Macarian Homilies helps to clarify the possible connection.

The Homily II.20 describes Christ as the true physician of human nature who can heal the human soul and adorn it with the garments of his grace. It is evident that the theme of healing is interwoven in the homily with the motif of the luminous garments. In unfolding this theme, the homilist, first, retells the Gospel story about the woman who was cured of the blood flow by touching of the garment of the Lord, and connects the motif of healing with the theme of the garments:

> …and again just as the woman afflicted with an issue of blood believed truly and touched the hem of the garment of the Lord and immediately received a healing and the flow of the unclean fountain of blood dried up…[50]

Following the story of the healed woman, Macarius proceeds to the examples of Adam and Moses. It is not a coincidence that in this homily, as in *4Q504*, Moses' name is mentioned in connection with the theme of healing. From the homily II.20.6, we learn that "indeed, Moses came, but he was unable to bring a perfect healing (ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἴασιν παντελῆ δοῦναι)."[51] The conflation of Moses' figure with the healing motif in the Macarian Homilies is intriguing since it might indicate that the author of the Homilies draws on the traditions similar to those that can be found in *4Q374*.[52]

"4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," 238.

[49] García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.740–741.

[50] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 151.

[51] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 151. Dörries, 190.

[52] Cf. also the Homily I.2.12.7–9: "…the devil, by means of a tree and serpent, used jealousy and trickery to deceive Adam and Eve, and arranged [for them] to be thrown out of Paradise, and brought them down from their purity and glory to bitter passions and death, and subsequently, having received from them the whole human race [to be] under his power, caused [it] to stray into every sin and defiling passion … by his inexpressible wisdom, God, making provisions for humanity, send forth Moses the healer to redeem the People through the wood of his staff … therefore half of piety was set aright through Moses, and half of the passions *healed* (ἰάθη)…." Alexander Golitzin,

The affinities between the healing motif found in the Macarian Homilies and in *4Q374* include another important feature. Both texts interpret healing to be the healing of the human heart. The Qumran material speaks that after the healing through Moses' shining countenance the hearts of the Israelites were "strengthened" again.[53]

The Homily II.20.7 also links the motif of healing with the theme of the curing (or cleansing) of the human heart. It tells that "man could be healed only by the help of this medicine and thus could attain life by a cleansing of his heart by the Holy Spirit."[54]

It seems that in both excerpts (*4Q374* and Macarian), the luminosity of Moses' face plays an important role. Although the Macarian passage does not directly refer to the shining face of Moses, the context of the passage, which deals with the garments of the Lord, indicates that in the Macarian Homilies the motif of "healing" is understood as the restoration of the former Adamic glory, the glorious garments with which the first humans were clothed in Eden before their transgression. The author of the Homilies seems to view Moses' shining face as an important step in the process of the recovery of the former divine glory once manifested in humans during their life in Paradise. According to the homilist, the glory would be restored in humanity only later, in the event of the incarnation of Christ, which brings "perfect healing" to the wretched human nature. In this context, Moses' shining face appears to be an important, even if not a "final," step in the process of healing of human nature.[55]

The Macarian Homilies from Collection I, 9 (forthcoming); *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)*, 1.24.

[53] García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.741.

[54] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 152.

[55] It is noteworthy that Macarius again follows here the established tradition which connects the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ. The beginning of such a tradition can be found in 2Cor 3:7–4:6. See: J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif," *JTS* 42 (1981) 630–644; A. Orlov and A. Golitzin, "Many Lamps are Lightened from the One: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies," *VC* 55 (2001) 281–298. The Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem to be also influenced by the Moses typology. Several details in the accounts serve as important reminders of Mosaic tradition(s): the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration, see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies

An additional detail that connects Moses with Adam is that the homilist understands Adam's deprivation of the luminosity as the wound which requires healing.[56] In II.20.1 and 20. 4–5, Macarius links the loss of the external luminous attire by Adam with the internal wound. The homilist tells that the human being who…

> …is naked and lacks the divine and heavenly garment…is covered with the great shame of evil affections… since … the enemy, when Adam fell, used such cunning and diligence that he wounded and darkened the interior man… man was, therefore, so wounded that no one else could cure him…[57]

Despite the extensive "usage" of the Moses typology in the Macarian discussion of the Adamic "wound," the whole purpose of this employment remains Christological. Here again Macarius uses Mosaic traditions as the mediative tool for his glory Christology.

The Homily II.20 recounts that Moses' "healing" was incomplete in comparison with the healing of Christ, since it was "external" and unable to heal the inner wound inflicted by Satan at the Fall. In II.32.4, Macarius sums up the Mosaic argument by telling us that:

> …Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.[58]

Although Macarius tries to diminish the significance of Moses' shining face in the process of healing the human heart, he still seems to draw heavily on the Jewish traditions similar to *4Q374*, where Moses is depicted as the healer of the darkened human nature.[59]

---

in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1986), 1–19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 80–93; M.E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969–1970) 305–317.

[56] It should be noted that despite the fact that the motif of Adam's luminous clothing is widespread in Aramaic and Syriac milieux, the conflation of this theme with the imagery of healing seem unique. See Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," 11–40.

[57] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 151.

[58] Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 198.

[59] The Macarian Homilies, therefore, can be seen as the set of the intense polemics with the Jewish developments.

Conclusion

It should be noted in conclusion that the examination of the Adam–Moses connection in the Macarian Homilies and in the Qumran fragments might be mutually beneficial for a better understanding of both textual corpora.

First, the evidences to Adamic and Mosaic accounts found in the Macarian writings can extend the possible scope of the traditions which were preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls materials in a very fragmentary form. In the light of the Macarian evidence, which provided an additional context for such traditions, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the passage from *4Q374* might speak about the healing power of Moses' glorious face as healing the "wound" of Adam in the weak human nature. Therefore, in *4Q374*, as well as in *4Q504*, one might encounter a very early tradition depicting Moses as the glorious counterpart of Adam, the theme that later became a famous leitmotif in numerous Jewish and Christian materials. Despite the fact that the Qumran passage about the healing in *4Q374* lacks any reference to Adam or to his glorious garments, its close affinities with the later Macarian evidence, where such connections are explicitly made, seem to clarify the proper meaning of the Qumran reference.

Second, it is also evident that both *4Q504* and *4Q374* can provide further insights for the background of the Adamic and Mosaic traditions in the Macarian Homilies. Despite their fragmentary character, these Qumran evidences about Adam and Moses help one see that the Macarian employment of the Mosaic traditions has in fact a strong polemical nature. The Syrian father seems to try to diminish the significance of Moses' "glorification" in the process of "healing" human nature, depicting it as the *external* covering unable to heal the inner wound caused by the Adamic transgression. However, the testimony to the Mosaic tradition found in *4Q374* demonstrates that the emphasis on the internal character of the healing was already made at Qumran, where Moses' luminosity was depicted to be potent to heal the human heart.

THE HEIRS OF THE ENOCHIC LORE: "MEN OF FAITH" IN *2 ENOCH* 35:2 AND *SEFER HEKHALOT* 48D:10[1]

> Make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first and let the worthy and the unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge.
>
> *4 Ezra* 14

Enoch and Moses

Chapter 35 of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse apparently written in the first century CE, unveils the story of the transmission of the Enochic scriptures and their important role in the last generation.[2] In *2 Enoch* 35:1–3 the Lord gives Enoch the following instruction about the destiny of his handwritings:

> And I will leave a righteous man from your tribe, together with all his house, who will act according to my will. And from his seed another generation will arise, the last of many, and very gluttonous. Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers, and the earthly guardians (**стражие**

[1] Part of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of SBL/AAR, San Antonio, 23–26 November 2004.

[2] A word must be said about the complex nature of the Slavonic text of this chapter. Francis Andersen observes that "very little is claimed for the translation of ch. 35 in either recension. The texts are parallel, but the numerous minor variations and uncertainty over the clause boundaries make all MSS rather unintelligible." He further suggests that "in the present stage of research all individual readings should be kept in mind as options." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 158. A close analysis of the Slavonic text in both recensions demonstrates that the shorter recension appears to have preserved the material in a more coherent form.

> земнии) [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith (моужемь вѣрнѣмь). And they will be recounted to that generation, and they will be glorified in the end more than in the beginning. *2 Enoch* 35:1–3 (shorter recension).[3]

The important detail of this account is that the transmission of the Enochic scriptures on earth will enable the earthly guardians of the books to convey the patriarch's writings to the Men of Faith (моужемь вѣрнѣмь).[4] The reference to the group "Men of Faith" as the last link in the chain of transmission of the Enochic scriptures is important for connecting the Slavonic apocalypse with the later Jewish mysticism since it attests to the terminology found in *Sefer Hekhalot*, also known as *3 Enoch*, a later Enochic text, preserved in a corpus of Hekhalot writings. In *3 Enoch* 48D:10 (*Synopse* §80) the Torah is initially given by Enoch-Metatron to Moses and then passed through the chain of transmission which eventually brings this revelation into the hands of the group designated as the Men of Faith. The passage reads:

> Metatron brought Torah out from my storehouses and committed it to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, Joshua to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Men of the Great Synagogue, the Men of the Great Synagogue to Ezra the Scribe, Ezra the Scribe to Hillel the Elder, Hillel the Elder to R. Abbahu, R. Abbahu to R. Zira, R. Zira to the Men of Faith, and the Men of Faith to the Faithful (לאנשי אמונה ואנשי אמונה לבעלי אמונות).[5]

Scholars have previously noted that this succession of the mystical tradition recalls the chain of transmission of the oral law preserved in *Pirke Abot*, the *Sayings of the Fathers*.[6] *m*. Abot 1:1 reads:

> Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things:

---

[3] M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 1.93.

[4] This expression is attested in the MSS of both recensions. See M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 1.35 and 1.93.

[5] P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.315; *Synopse* §80.

[6] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 315; M. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*: *Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 188.

> Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the Law.[7]

The Hekhalot writer reworks the traditional Mishnaic arrangement of prophets, rabbis, and sages by placing at the beginning of the chain the figure of Enoch-Metatron, posed there as the initial revealer. As the final heirs of this revelation, he adds an enigmatic group whom he designates as the Men of Faith. These Men of Faith (**אנשי אמונה**), along with the Faithful (**בעלי אמונות**),[8] represent the last link in the chain of the transmission to whom the Torah will be eventually handed. This group is unknown in *Pirke Abot* (PA) and similar clusters of the early traditions attested in *Abot d' R. Nathan* (PRN).[9] These designations similar to the one found in *2 Enoch* help to strengthen the hypothesis proposed by Gershom Scholem and other scholars that *2 Enoch* contains the earliest formulations of Jewish mystical developments.

Philip Alexander suggests that the expression "Men of Faith" (**אנשי אמונה**) and the "Faithful" (**בעלי אמונות**) found in *Sefer Hekhalot* "appear to be quasi-technical terms for the mystics."[10] Michael Swartz offers a similar hypothesis proposing that the enigmatic Men of Faith and the Faithful, who occupy the last place in the line of transmission in *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D, may refer to either the mystics themselves or to their mythic ancestors.[11] Both Alexander[12] and Swartz note that the term **בעלי אמונה** appeared among the synonyms for the group of mystics in a hymn in *Hekhalot Rabbati.* The hymn connects the divine attribute with the designation of the group.[13]

---

[7] H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 446.

[8] Swartz renders this term as the "Possessors of the Faith." See Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 179.

[9] On the chain of tradition in *Pirke Abot* and *Abot d' R. Nathan* see: E. Bickerman, "La chaîne de la tradition pharisienne," *RB* 59 (1951) 44–54; L. Finkelstein, "Introductory Study to Pirke Abot," *JBL* 57 (1938) 13–50; A.J. Saldarini, "The End of the Rabbinic Chain of Tradition," *JBL* 93 (1974) 97–106; *idem*, *Scholastic Rabbinism: A Literary Study of the Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).

[10] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 315, note v.

[11] Swartz observes that "it is likely that these terms refer either to the mystics themselves, or, perhaps, mythic ancestors patterned after Elders and the Men of the Great Assembly and influenced by the appearance of terms such as **אנשי אמונה** in talmudic literature." Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 188.

[12] Alexander also observes that in the *Alphabet of R. Aqiba* (Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrash* 3.29) "'the men of faith' constitute a distinct category of the righteous in the world to come." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 315, note v.

[13] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 315, note v; Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 188.

It is intriguing that in *2 Enoch*, as in the Hekhalot passage, Enoch-Metatron's revelation will also be handed eventually to the Men of Faith (**моужемь вѣрнъım**).[14] In light of the Hekhalot evidence, this reference may hold the key to the enigma of the early designation of the mysterious group which stands behind the early Jewish mystical speculations reflected in *2 Enoch*. It is significant that the designation of the ultimate receptors of the esoteric lore is identical in both traditions. The Hekhalot reference may, therefore, have an Enochic provenance. Despite the fact that the reference to the chain of transmission is repeated several times in the Hekhalot literature, the reference to the Men of Faith and the Faithful in the chain is made only in the "Enochic" passage from *3 Enoch* 48D.[15] It is possible that the author of the passage combines the two traditions by adding to the mishnaic line of transmission reflected in *Pirke Abot* and *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* a new Enochic group, similar to those found in *2 Enoch* 35. The table below illustrates these combinations:

2 Enoch 35:2	*m.* Abot 1:1	*Synopse* §80
Then at the conclusion of that generation the books in your handwriting will be revealed, and those of your fathers,	Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue…	Metatron brought it [Torah] out from my storehouses and committed it to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, Joshua to the Elders, the Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Men of the Great Synagogue, the Men of the Great Synagogue to Ezra the Scribe, Ezra the Scribe to Hillel the Elder, Hillel the Elder to R. Abbahu, R. Abbahu to R. Zira, R. Zira to the Men of Faith, and the Men of Faith to the Faithful.
and the earthly guardians [of these books] will show them to the Men of Faith.	…make a fence around the Law.	

[14] It appears that the expression found in *2 Enoch* 35:2 can be related to both designations since the Slavonic **моужемь вѣрнъım** can be translated also as the Faithful (men).

[15] For the detailed analysis of this evidence see Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 178ff.

It is also noteworthy that the Enochic influences are now apparent not only in the end of this newly-constructed chain but also in its beginning, where the figure of the translated patriarch is hidden behind the name of the exalted angel Metatron who passes the initial revelation to Moses. In such a perspective the Mosaic successors and Moses himself represent only intermediate temporal guardians whose role is to pass the revealed knowledge into the hands of its true owners, the heirs of the Enochic tradition.[16]

An important detail of *3 Enoch's* account is its anti-Mosaic flavor: the authors of the passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* try to diminish the importance of Moses and the transmitters of the Mosaic Torah by depicting the son of Amram in a role inferior to Enoch-Metatron from whom Moses receives his revelation. Scholars previously noted that this tendency to depict Metatron as a greater Moses was widespread in the Merkabah accounts. Several years ago David Halperin in his book *The Faces of the Chariot*[17] demonstrated the popularity of such comparative imagery, which reflects the polemical character of the Merkabah portrayals of Moses and Metatron. He noted that in these materials Metatron is always depicted as "a greater Moses … more exactly, he is Moses gone a step farther. Moses ascends to heaven; Metatron becomes ruler of heaven. Moses defeats the angels; Metatron dominates them. Moses grasps God's throne; Metatron sits on a throne identical to it. When Metatron grants revelation to Moses, he is giving a helping hand to his junior alter ego… . These authors … saw the exalted Metatron as the primary figure, the ascending Moses as his junior replica."[18]

Halperin's work sees the initial background of the Merkabah polemical comparisons between the son of Amram and Metatron in Moses' ascension stories reflected in the rabbinic materials associated with the *Shabu'ot* circle.[19] He suggested that "as historians of the tradition … we must reverse the relationships [between Moses and Metatron]. First the *Shabu'ot* preachers had Moses invade heaven and lay hold of the throne.

---

[16] In this respect *2 Enoch* 35 operates with the concept of the "earthly guardians" (**стражие земнии**) as the agents responsible for handling Enoch's writings until they finally are brought into the hands of the "Men of Faith." The expression "earthly guardians" might reflect a polemic with the Mosaic notion of the transmission and preservation of the revelation as "guarding." Among other places, such a concept is reflected in the famous rabbinic saying from *m.* Abot 1:1 where the preserving of the tradition is designated as "making the fence around the Torah."

[17] Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot.*

[18] Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 426.

[19] Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 289ff.

Then the authors of the Hekhalot, breaking the restraints of the older stories, let Metatron enjoy the fruits of conquest."[20]

Still, despite Halperin's suggestions about the formative value and primacy of the rabbinic *Shabu'ot* testimonies for Moses-Metatron polemical interactions, it is possible that already in the Second Temple Enochic materials, namely in *2 Enoch*, the Enochic authors attempted to portray the Mosaic hero as a junior replica of Enoch-Metatron.

In my previously published articles, I argued that *2 Enoch* reveals an intricate web of the mediatorial debates in the course of which several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in the Second Temple Judaism, including Adam, Noah, and Moses, underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features were transferred to the seventh antediluvian hero.[21] These polemical trends seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial interactions widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in *2 Enoch* are part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges of its exalted rivals.

In my previous work I tried to show that in *2 Enoch* many theophanic features of Moses' story were transferred to Enoch.[22] Two of such prominent characteristics are the motifs of the glorious face of the seventh antediluvian hero and his encounter with the Deity's hand during his celestial metamorphosis. Our study must now proceed to the investigation of these two motifs in *2 Enoch's* materials.

Luminous Face of Enoch

From the Slavonic apocalypse one learns that the vision of the divine Face has dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the divine Countenance, an important detail can be found which further links Enoch's transforma-

---

[20] Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 426.

[21] A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273; *idem*, "Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38; *idem*, "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.

[22] A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 39 (2000) 130–147.

tion with Moses' account in the Book of Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 one learns about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face at the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs us that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel was "terrifying and frightful," and appeared frozen; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. With these cold hands he then chilled the patriarch's face. Right after this chilling procedure, the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at him.[23] This reference to the dangerous radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Exodus 34.[24]

Exodus 34:29–35 portrays Moses after his encounter with the Lord. The passage relates that

> Moses came down from Mount Sinai … Moses did not know that the skin of his face shone because he had been talking with God. When Aaron and all the Israelites saw Moses, the skin of his face was shining, and they were afraid to come near him… and Moses would put the veil on his face again, until he went in to speak with him.

This passage unambiguously constitutes the Mosaic background of the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 37, where Enoch's face is depicted as similar to Moses' face who shields his luminous visage with a veil. The transference of the Mosaic motif into the framework of the Enochic tradition is made here for the first time. It is also obvious that this transferal has a polemical character. Passing on to the patriarch such a salient detail of the biblical story would immediately invoke in the Enochic readers the memory of Moses' example. Such transference also intends to demonstrate that Moses' encounter at Sinai and his luminous face represent later, inferior imitations of the primeval account of the patriarch's vision, a vision which occurred not on earth but in heaven in the antediluvian time.

The polemical appropriation of the Mosaic motif of the seer's radiant face is not confined in *2 Enoch* solely to the encounter with the "frozen" angel, but is reflected also in other sections of the book. According to the Slavonic apocalypse, despite the chilling procedure performed in heaven, Enoch's face appears to have retained its trans-

---

[23] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 160.

[24] *Apoc. Paul* 20 describes Enoch as the scribe of righteousness whose face shines "as the sun."

formative power and is even able to glorify other human subjects. In *2 Enoch* 64:2 people ask the transformed Enoch for blessings so they can be glorified in front of his face.[25] This theme of the transforming power of the patriarch's visage may also have a polemical flavor.

The theme of the luminous countenance of the seer is also important for the ongoing discussion of the Enoch-Metatron connection. It should not be forgotten that *2 Enoch's* appropriation of the Mosaic imagery serves as the formative framework for the later Enoch-Metatron accounts, and especially for the one reflected in the so-called additional chapters[26] of *Sefer Hekhalot*. In these chapters the theme of the luminosity of Moses' face and Metatron's visage are also put in a polemical juxtaposition. From *3 Enoch* 15B one learns that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face was once transformed into fire, who tells Moses about his shining visage:[27] "At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to Moses, 'Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other.'"[28] Here Moses is portrayed as a later version of his master Enoch-Metatron whose face and body were transformed into blazing fire long before the prophet's ascension at Sinai.[29]

---

[25] See *2 Enoch* 64:4 (the longer recension): "And now bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 190.

[26] For a critical assessment of the theory of "core" and "additions" in *Sefer Hekhalot*, consult Peter Schäfer, "Handschriften zur Hekhalot-Literatur," in: P. Schäfer, *Hekhalot Studien* (TSAJ 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 228–229; *idem*, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur*, 1.LI.

[27] Scholars have observed that in the Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified as the hypostatic Face of God. See, for example, *Synopse* §§396–397: "…The Lord of all the worlds warned Moses that he should beware of his face. So it is written, 'Beware of his face' …. This is the prince who is called Yofiel Yah-dariel … he is called Metatron." On Metatron as the hypostatic Face of God see A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999) 329; Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 424–425.

[28] *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 304. See also *Raza Rabbah*, where again a similar connection is made between Metatron's face and Moses' visage.

[29] *Synopse* §19 (*3 Enoch* 15:1) depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch–Metatron: "When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 267.

The Lord's Hand

It is possible that the new theophanic imagery transferred to the Enochic hero in the Slavonic apocalypse might derive not only from the biblical accounts of the Sinai encounter, but also from the extra-biblical Mosaic stories in which the profile of the exalted prophet has a more advanced form. The authors of *2 Enoch* may have been carefully following here the theological unfolding of the story of their rival and the enhancement of his profile as an elevated figure. The familiarity of Enochic authors with the Second Temple extra-biblical Mosaic accounts can be illustrated through an examination of the motif of the Deity's hand; this hand embraces and protects the seer during his encounter with the Lord in the upper realm.

In *2 Enoch* 39 the patriarch relates to his children that during his vision of the divine *Kavod*, the Lord helped him with his right hand. The hand here is described as having a gigantic size and filling heaven: "But you, my children, see the right hand of one who helps you, a human being created identical to yourself, but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, *helping me* (**помагающоу ми**) and *filling heaven* (**испльнѣающоу небо**)."[30] The theme of the hand of God assisting the seer during his vision of the Face recalls the Mosaic account from Exodus 33:22–23. Here the Deity promises the prophet to protect him with his hand during the encounter with the divine *Panim*: "and while my glory passes by I will put you in a cleft of the rock, and I will cover you with my hand until I have passed by; then I will take away my hand, and you shall see my back; but my face shall not be seen." There is also another early Mosaic account where the motif of the divine hand assisting the visionary is mentioned. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian[31] relates

[30] *2 Enoch* 39:5. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 162; Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.38.

[31] This significant early testimony to the exalted profile of Moses has survived as a part of the drama *Exagoge*, a writing attributed to Ezekiel the Tragedian. The account depicts the prophet's experience at Sinai as his celestial enthronement. *Exagoge* 67–90 reads: "Moses: I had a vision of a great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) on the top of Mount Sinai and it reached till the folds of heaven. A noble man was sitting on it, with a crown and a large scepter (μέγα σκῆπτρον) in his left hand. He beckoned to me with his right hand, so I approached and stood before the throne. He gave me the scepter and instructed me to sit on the great throne. Then he gave me a royal crown and got up from the throne. I beheld the whole earth all around and saw beneath the earth and above the heavens. A multitude of stars fell before my knees and I counted them all. They paraded past me like a battalion of men. Then I awoke from my sleep in fear. Raguel: My friend (ὦ ξένε), this is a good sign from God. May I live to see the day

that during the prophet's vision of the *Kavod*, a noble man sitting on the throne beckoned him with his right hand (δεξιᾷ δέ μοι ἔνευσε).[32]

It is conceivable that *2 Enoch's* description is closer to the form of the tradition preserved in Ezekiel the Tragedian than to the account found in Exodus since the *Exagoge* mentions the right hand of the Deity beckoning the seer. The passage from the Slavonic apocalypse also mentions the right hand of the Lord. Further there is another terminological parallel that unifies the two accounts. While the longer recension of *2 Enoch* uses the term "helping" (**помагающоу**) in reference to the divine hand, some manuscripts of the shorter recension employ the word "beckoning" (**помавающи**), the term used in the *Exagoge*.

The terminological affinities between the *Exagoge* and *2 Enoch* point to the possibility that the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse, in their development of the theme of the divine hand, were relying not only on the tradition preserved in Exodus but also on more advanced Mosaic speculations similar to those found in Ezekiel the Tragedian.

Although *2 Enoch's* description is very similar to the *Exagoge*'s passage, the Slavonic apocalypse has a more advanced version of the mystical imagery; this imagery demonstrates close parallels to the symbolism of the Merkabah lore. The important detail here is that the divine hand is described as "filling heaven" (**исплыѣающоу небо**).[33] This description recalls the language of the *Shi'ur Qomah* accounts, in which Metatron reveals to Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba the knowledge of the gigantic limbs of the Deity, limbs which fill heaven. It has already been noted that the allusion to this mystical imagery in the Slavonic apocalypse does not appear to be happenstance since it is incorporated there into a series of analogical comparisons between Enoch's body and the Lord's body. These portrayals recall the later Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* accounts in which Enoch-Metatron is often portrayed as possessing the gigantic body himself.

---

when these things are fulfilled. You will establish a great throne, become a judge and leader of men. As for your vision of the whole earth, the world below and that above the heavens—this signifies that you will see what is, what has been and what shall be." H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 54–55. Wayne Meeks observes that, given its quotation by Alexander Polyhistor (ca. 80–40 BCE), this Mosaic account can be taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE. W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King*: *Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 149.

[32] H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 54.

[33] Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.38.

The motif of the Lord's hand, prominent in the early Enochic account, is not forgotten in the Merkabah materials, where one can learn that "the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron."[34] The motif of the divine hand assisting Enoch-Metatron during his celestial transformation is present in *Sefer Hekhalot*, where it appears in the form of tradition very similar to the evidence found in the *Exagoge* and *2 Enoch*. In *Synopse* §12 Metatron tells R. Ishmael that during the transformation of his body into the gigantic cosmic extent, matching the world in length and breadth, God "laid his hand" on the translated hero.[35] Here, just as in the Slavonic account, the hand of the Deity signifies the bond between the seer's body and the divine corporeality.

In *Sefer Hekhalot* the imagery of God's hand is also conflated with the Mosaic tradition. In *Synopse* §68 Enoch-Metatron unveils to Rabbi Ishmael the hypostatic right hand of God with which "955 heavens were created." This introduction of the divine hand is interwoven in *Synopse* §§68–69[36] into an elaborate set of references to Moses, to whom, according to the text, the mighty hand of God was once revealed. The author alludes to the passage from Isa 63:12, in which the Deity sends his glorious arm to be at Moses' right hand, as well as other Mosaic biblical themes. Although the name of the Israelite prophet is mentioned six times in this text, nothing is said about his exalted profile. It would seem appropriate there, since the main hero of this account is not Moses but the translated patriarch, who now unveils the mysteries of the divine hand to the visionary.

Moreover it seems that, in *Synopse* §§77–80,[37] Enoch-Metatron is understood, at least implicitly, as the hypostatic hand of the Deity himself. These materials depict the translated patriarch as the helping hand of God; with this helping hand God passes the Torah to the Mosaic hero and protects him against the hostility of angelic hosts.

After this short excursus into the theophanic polemical appropriations let us now return to our passage about the Men of Faith found in *Sefer Hekhalot* 48 where Enoch-Metatron is depicted as a revealer superior to Moses.

---

[34] *Synopse* §384.

[35] "…the Holy One, blessed be he, laid his hand on me and blessed me with 1,365,000 blessings. I was enlarged and increased in size until I matched the world in length and breadth." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 263.

[36] *3 Enoch* 48A.

[37] *3 Enoch* 48D.

As I mentioned earlier, it appears that the main point of the polemical interactions in *3 Enoch* 48 is to assert the supremacy of Enoch-Metatron as the revealer of Torah and the primacy of his revelation before the disclosure given to Moses. It is possible that the polemics about the primacy of the Enochic Torah before the Torah of Moses can be already seen in *2 Enoch*, a text which in many ways anticipates *Sefer Hekhalot* developments and where one can find a similar terminology pertaining to the enigmatic group of the "Men of Faith" to whom the Enochic books will be eventually given.

Enoch's Revelation

The theme of Enochic revelation as the disclosure alternative to the Mosaic Torah looms large in chapters 24–32 of the Slavonic Enoch. In these chapters the reader encounters a lengthy narrative of God's revelation to the exalted patriarch about the seven days of creation. It depicts the Deity dictating to his celestial scribe, the patriarch Enoch, the account of creation organized in almost the same fashion as the first chapter of the biblical Genesis. The Lord starts his narration with the familiar phrase "in the beginning": "Before anything existed at all, from the very beginning (**испръва**),[38] whatever exists I created from the non-existent, and from the invisible." Although the very first line of the narration brings to memory the beginning of the Mosaic Torah, the creational account itself is quite different from the one reflected in the biblical Genesis. The story contains imagery pertaining to the primeval order and to the creation of humanity that is completely missing from the biblical text. Although the Enochic scribes try to preserve the structural grid of the Genesis story by organizing it around the seven days of creation, the plot is greatly expanded with new striking details and unknown characters, among whom one can find, for example, the cosmogonic figures designated as Adoil and Arukhas. The structure of this narration, involving the seven days of creation looks odd and disproportional in comparison with its biblical counterpart. Still, the composers of this peculiar version of the alternative Genesis[39] try to hold on to the

[38] Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.24.

[39] The "alternative" thrust of *2 Enoch's* creational account is so transparent that the editors of the *Other Bible* included this Enochic narrative as the non-canonical counterpart of the first chapters of Genesis.

familiar organization that replaces the memory of its Mosaic version. It is clearly fashioned as an alternative intended to overwrite an essential part of the Mosaic revelation. It is significant that despite the Enochic authors' attempt to deconstruct the well-known ancient account, the purported antediluvian reception of their disclosure speaks for itself, silently postulating the primacy of this revelation over the one received several generations later by Moses on Mount Sinai. It is also important that unlike in *1 Enoch*, in the Slavonic apocalypse God reveals to the seer not simply astronomical information or a warning about the upcoming judgment, but a disclosure fashioned in form and structure similarly to the Mosaic Torah. The mode of reception is also different since the revelation is received not simply as a seer's dream, similar to the vision of the Biblical history in the *Animal Apocalypse*, but as directly dictated by God.

The chapters following the creation account in *2 Enoch* 24–32 are also important for our discussion since they convey knowledge about the function and the future role of this alternative version of the first chapters of the Mosaic Torah. From *2 Enoch* 33:8–12 one learns that the revelation recorded by Enoch will be transmitted from generation to generation and it will not be destroyed until the final age. The two following chapters (*2 Enoch* 34 and 35) also pertain to the themes of God's revelation to Enoch and the destiny of his books. The theme of the Enochic books is conflated here with the notions of the yoke and the commandments: after informing the seer that his handwritings and the handwritings of his ancestors will not perish in the upcoming flood, God reminds the seer about the wickedness of humans who have rejected the divine commandments and are not willing to carry the yoke (ꙗрмо)[40] which the Deity placed on them. It is curious that the terminology of "yoke" and "commandments" follows here the theme of Enochic writings. Scholars have previously proposed that the term "yoke" might be reserved here for the Torah. Celia Deutsch observes that "the yoke here refers to Torah, as is indicated by its use with 'commandments.'"[41] She also notes that this theme is further expanded in *2 Enoch* 48:9, where it includes the teaching received by Enoch and transmitted through the revealed books.[42] In *2 Enoch* 48:9 the author of

[40] Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.34.

[41] C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30* (JSNTSS, 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987) 116.

[42] Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*, 116.

the Slavonic apocalypse is openly connecting the patriarch's scriptures with the notion of the "yoke," which serves here as an alternative designation for the Torah,[43] the Torah of Enoch.

Conclusion

In view of the polemical interactions between Enochic and Mosaic traditions detected in the Slavonic apocalypse, one no longer needs to follow David Halperin's advice by clarifying the relationships between Moses and Enoch-Metatron on the basis of the later rabbinic testimonies to the *Shabu'ot* circle. Already in the Second Temple materials, specifically in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, Enochic authors sought to portray the Mosaic hero as a junior replica of Enoch-Metatron and his revelation as the disclosure inferior to the one received by the seventh antediluvian patriarch. The passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* 48D:10 also attests to this long-lasting rivalry between Moses and Enoch. Yet in comparison with the author of *2 Enoch*, the task of the Hekhalot author seems more complex—he cannot simply overwrite the Mosaic Torah, keeping silence about its revealer, as did the Enochic authors of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon. He must reconcile the two revelations. This is why in his version of the story, the Men of Faith become a link in the familiar Mosaic line of rabbis, sages, and prophets.

[43] It should be noted that although *2 Enoch* 34 and *2 Enoch* 48 use two different terms for "yoke" (*2 Enoch 34* uses **ѩрмо** and *2 Enoch* 48 uses **иго**), both of these Slavonic words designate the same concept. Thus, Sreznevskij's dictionary relates both **ѩрмо** and **иго** to the Greek ζυγός and the Latin *iugum*. I.I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989) 1.1019 and 3.1663. Barhudarov's dictionary also lists the two terms as synonyms. S.G. Barhudarov, *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.* (25 vols.; Moscow: Nauka, 1975) 6.78–79; J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae)*(4 vols.; Prague, 1958–1992) 1.703.

THE NOAH TRADITION

"NOAH'S YOUNGER BROTHER": THE ANTI-NOACHIC POLEMICS IN *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*[*]

In recent years there has been a growing number of publications devoted to the Noachic traditions.[1] Even though the book of Noah is not listed in the ancient catalogues of the apocryphal books,[2] the writings attributed to Noah are mentioned in such early materials as the

[*] I am indebted to professor Michael Stone for his useful comments and criticism of this work. All errors that remain are, of course, my responsibility alone.

[1] On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231; D. Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 123–150; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 24–44; *idem*, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–108; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 242–254; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115; J.M. Scott, "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.E. Evans; JSPS, 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 368–381; R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71; M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–149; M. Stone, "Noah, Books of," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971), 12.1198; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars, 1980), 13–32; J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 213–231; Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah" *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–181.

[2] F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 24.

Book of Jubilees (*Jub.* 10:13[3] and *Jub.* 21:10),[4] the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran,[5] and the Greek fragment of the Levi document from Mount Athos.[6]

In addition to the titles of the lost Noah's book, several fragmentary materials associated with the early Noachic traditions have survived. Most researchers agree that some parts of the lost book of Noah "have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* and that some manuscripts of Qumran[7] preserve some traces of it."[8]

A large bulk of the surviving Noachic fragments is associated with the Enochic materials. This association points to an apparent unity behind the "Enoch-Noah's axis." In some Pseudepigrapha texts, "the words of Noah" often follow closely "the words of Enoch." From the earliest Enochic materials we can see this interdependence between Noachic and Enochic traditions. H. Kvanvig points out that in Noachic traditions Noah and Enoch often appear in the same roles.[9]

In some Enochic writings, however, this long-lasting unity of Enoch and Noah appears to be broken for some reasons. They ignore the "Enoch-Noah axis" and show fierce theological polemics against Noah and the traditions associated with his name. One of the Pseudepigrapha texts which attests to such uncommon criticisms against Noah is *2 Enoch.*[10] The purpose of this study is to investigate these anti-Noachic

---

[3] "Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine…" J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 2.60.

[4] "…because this is the way I found (it) written in the book of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.123.

[5] "The Book of the Words of Noah" col. 5, line 29. Cf. R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71.

[6] "For thus my father Abraham commanded me for thus he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood" §57. J.C. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Aramaic and Greek Fragments of a Levi Document," *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge; SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 465. Among other important late allusions to Noah's writings, the *Chronography* of Syncellus and the *Book of Asaph the Physician* should be mentioned. See F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 25 and 38.

[7] According to F. García Martínez, the following Qumran materials are related to the Book of Noah: 1QapGen 1–17, 1Q19; 1Q20; 4Q534 (4QMess Ar), and 6Q8. Cf. F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 43–44.

[8] F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 26.

[9] H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 117. On Enoch's roles cf. A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86.

[10] M. Stone notes that "an extensive development of Noachic traditions is to be

tendencies in the Slavonic text of *2 Enoch*. In our further analysis we will examine certain features of Noah's story which come under attack in these polemics.

Noah's Sacrifices

Gen 8:20 pictures Noah's animal sacrifice after his debarkation. It may be the first account of an animal sacrifice on the altar found in the Bible. Although Abel's animal offerings are mentioned in Gen 4:4, these sacrifices did not establish any significant sacrificial pattern for future generations.[11] Until Noah, the Bible does not attest to any ongoing tradition of animal sacrifices. When *Jub*. mentions the offerings of Adam and Enoch, it refers to them as incense sacrifices.[12]

Noah thus can be regarded as the originator of the official ongoing tradition of animal sacrifices. He is also the first person to have received from the Lord the commandment about the blood. As M. Stone observes, Noah's connection to the sacrificial cult and to instructions concerning the blood was not accidental.[13]

In *2 Enoch*, however, the role of Noah as a pioneer of animal sacrificial practice is challenged by a different story. We learn in this text that immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Achuzan,[14] the place where Enoch had been taken up.[15] In

---

observed in *2 Enoch* 71–72 which rewrites the story of Noah's birth, transferring the special traditions to Melkisedek." M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 139.

[11] Cf. M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

[12] "On that day, as he was leaving the Garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance—frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices…" *Jub*. 3:27; "He burned the evening incense of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense." *Jub*. 4:25. J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.20 and 2.28.

[13] Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

[14] Slav. **ѩχоуѕань**.

[15] The text of *2 Enoch* defines this place as the center of the world, the place Achuzan, i.e. in the center of the world, where Adam was created. Compare with Ezek 48:20–21 where the Hebrew word **אחוה** "special property of God" applies to Jerusalem and the Temple. Cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 114; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992), 195.

2 Enoch, chapter 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him the priest before the people. Verses 11–16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The texts says that the people brought sheep, oxen, and birds (all of which have been inspected) for Methuselah to sacrifice them before the face of the Lord.[16] Further, the text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, "in the required manner," sheep and oxen placed at the head of the altar.[17] All these sheep and oxen, of course, are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. It is apparent that Methuselah's role in the animal sacrificial practice conflicts with the canonical role of Noah as the originator of the animal sacrificial tradition.

The text[18] poses a more formidable challenge to Noah's unique place in the sacrificial tradition by indicating that before his death Methuselah passes his priestly/sacrificial duties to the younger brother of Noah—the previously unknown Nir. Chapter 70 of *2 Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, Methuselah's grandson Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's[19] firstborn son),[20] even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. The text only tells about the response of the people to that request: "Let it be so for us, and let the word of the Lord be just as he said to you." Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood

---

[16] F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.199.

[17] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 198–199.

[18] It should be stressed that both the longer and the shorter recensions of *2 Enoch* include all significant points of the anti-Noachic polemics. There is no substantial difference between the recensions in the representation of these materials. During my analysis I have used illustrations from both recensions in equal proportions.

[19] Lamech died before Methuselah. According to the Masoretic text of Gen 5:26–31, after Lamech was born, Methuselah lived 782 years… Lamech lived a total of 777 years.

[20] This priestly succession from Methuselah to Nir is an apparent violation of all the norms of traditional succession. Cf. the traditional view in *Jub.* 7:38–39: "For this is how Enoch, your father's father, commanded his son Methuselah; then Methuselah his son Lamech; and Lamech commanded me everything that his fathers had commanded him. Now I am commanding you, my children, as Enoch commanded his son in the first jubilee." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.49–50.

before the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar."[21] He also taught him "everything that he would have to do among the people."[22]

The text offers a detailed description of Nir's sacrifice during which he commanded people to bring sheep, bulls, turtledoves, and pigeons. People brought them and tied them up at the head of the altar. Then Nir took the sacrificial knife and slaughtered them in the front of the face of the Lord.[23] The important detail here is that immediately following the sacrifice the text offers the formula in which the Lord is proclaimed to be the God of Nir. This title apparently stresses the patriarchal authority of Nir: "and all people made merry in front of the face of the Lord, and on that day they glorified the Lord, the God of heaven and earth, (the God) of Nir"[24] 70:21–22.[25]

Noah as an Originator of Sacrificial Instruction

The teaching about sacrifices comes from ancient times and is connected with Noah both in *Jub.* 21 and in the Levi document (Mount Athos) §57.[26] *Jub.* 21:10 refers to the sacrificial traditions written "in the words of Enoch and in the words of Noah."[27] The first part of this statement about Enoch as the originator of sacrificial instruction fully agrees with *2 Enoch*'s story. The text offers a lengthy account of Enoch's sacrificial prescriptions to his sons during his short visit to the earth. These instructions have a form of sacrificial halakhot. The halakhic character of these commands is reinforced by the specific Slavonic vocabulary which employs the term **законь** ("law") in reference to these sacrificial regulations. The text stresses that "he who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil law,[28] he acts lawlessly[29] with his own

---

[21] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 197–203.

[22] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 202–203.

[23] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 202.

[24] Slav. **Господа Бога небеси и земла Нирева**. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 1.70.

[25] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 202.

[26] Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

[27] J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.123.

[28] Slav. **беззаконие**. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.100.

[29] Slav. **беззаконить**. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.100.

soul." Clearly, the passage speaks not about secular legal prescriptions, but about the halakhic precepts. The Slavonic word **законь** commonly used to denote a binding custom or a rule of conduct in the community, in some instances, carries a much more restricted, technical meaning: it sometimes refers to the Mosaic Law and serves as an alternate designation for "halakha."[30]

Enoch's sacrificial precepts occupy an important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. Some of these sacrificial rules, however, have an apparent sectarian flavor. In chapter 59, Enoch offers Methuselah, as well as his brothers—Regim, Ariim, Akhazukhan, Kharimion—and the elders of all the people, some instructions in animal sacrifices. These halakhot include the following guidelines:

1. Enoch commands his sons to use clean beasts in their sacrifices. According to his prescriptions, "he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul."[31]

2. Enoch teaches his sons that they should not touch an ox because of the "outflow."[32]

3. Enoch's prescriptions address the issue of the atoning sacrifices. He suggests that "a person bring one of the clean animals to make a sacrifice on account of sin, so that he may have healing for his soul."[33] Although the blood is not mentioned in these sacrificial prescriptions of Enoch, the text uses extensively the term "an animal soul." Enoch commands his sons to be cautious in dealing with animal souls, because those souls will accuse man in the day of judgment.[34]

4. Enoch also teaches his sons to bind sacrificial animals by four legs:

---

[30] Cf. P.I. Avanesov, ed., *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* XI–XIV vv. (10 vols.; Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1988–), 3.317–319; R.M. Cejtlin, ed., *Staroslovjanskij slovar' po rukopisjam X–XI vekov* (Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994), 228; J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského [Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenica]* (4 vols.; Prague, 1958–1992), 1.643–644; I.I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989), 1.921–922.

[31] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 185.

[32] The terminology of this prescription is unclear. For a detailed discussion of the passage see Andersen, "2 Enoch," 184–185.

[33] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 184.

[34] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 185.

> …he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul. And everything which you have for food, bind it by four legs,[35] there is healing, he heals his soul. He who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil custom; he acts lawlessly with his own soul.[36]

S. Pines draws attention to this unique practice of tying together four legs during animal sacrifices. On the basis of a passage in the Mishna (*m.* Tamid 4:1) which states that each of the forelegs of the sacrificial animal was tied to the corresponding hind leg, Pines notes that the tying together of all four legs was contrary to the tradition.[37] Pines gives one of the two explanations found in the Gemara of the Babli that this disapproval sought to prevent the imitation of the customs of the heretics, *minim*[38] (the authors of Mishnaic sacrificial prescriptions considered the practice of tying together all four legs to have strong sectarian overtones). In his final conclusion, Pines suggests that "it may have been an accepted rite of a sect, which repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in Jerusalem. It might be conjectured that this sect might have been the Essenes, whose sacrificial usage differed according to the one reading of the passage of Josephus[39] from those practiced at the Temple."[40]

As we can see, *2 Enoch* depicts Enoch as the originator of the sacrificial instruction. Although some of these instructions are not necessarily canonical, the role of Enoch in the sacrificial tradition fully agrees with *Jub.* 21:10a. On the other hand, *2 Enoch* is completely silent about Noah's role in these sacrificial instructions. He is refered to neither as the originator of these instructions nor as their practitioner. While the text speaks several times about the future role of Noah as a "procreator" of the postdiluvian race,[41] it is silent about his place in

---

[35] Slav. **свѧжете є по четꙑре ноги**. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.100.

[36] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 185.

[37] S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption* (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and J. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 74–75.

[38] *b.* Tamid 31b.

[39] *Ant.* XVIII, 18.

[40] Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," 75.

[41] "Then I will preserve Noah, the firstborn son of your son Lamech. And I will make another world rise up from his seed, and his seed will exist throughout the ages" 70:10. Andersen, 203. "For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion, and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation" 71:37. Andersen, 209.

the priestly/sacrificial tradition. We might expect that Noah, then, will have an opportunity to do his part after the Flood, but the text, leaves out any significant role for Noah in the postdiluvian priestly/sacrificial tradition. The duty of the priestly successor is given to Nir's "son"—Melchizedek, who "will be the head of the priests"[42] in the postdiluvian generation. Noah's role is less prominent. According to the *Slavonic Enoch*, he "will be preserved in that generation for procreation."[43]

Noah and Divine Revelations

In the Bible and the Pseudepigrapha, Noah is portrayed as a recipient of divine revelations, given to him both before and after the Flood. In Gen 6:13–21 and Gen 7:1–5, God speaks to Noah about the Deluge and the construction of the ark. The evidence for the direct communication between God and Noah is further supported by *1 Enoch* 67, *Jub.* 5, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* 6–7. According to the Pseudepigrapha, Noah also enjoys various angelic revelations. In *1 Enoch* 10:1–3, an angel Asuryal warns Noah about the upcoming destruction of the earth. *Jub.* 10:1–14 records an angelic revelation to Noah about evil spirits and healing herbs which he wrote in a book and gave to Shem, his oldest son.[44] Scholars also believe that in *1 Enoch* 60 it is Noah who was described as a visionary.[45]

These traditions depict Noah as the chosen vessel of divine revelation who alone found favor in the sight of the Lord in the antediluvian turmoil.[46]

These details and emphases on the direct communication between the Lord and Noah are challenged by the information about Noah found in *2 Enoch*. As has been shown earlier, in the *Slavonic Enoch* Noah keeps a low profile. Although Noah is the firstborn of Lamech, he is portrayed as a family man, a helper to his prominent younger brother

---

[42] Andersen, 211.

[43] Andersen, 209.

[44] J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

[45] Kvanvig argues that "in *1 Enoch* 60, 1–10.24c–25 Noah is described as a visionary (as in 4QMess Ar) and in a vision he is warned about the coming catastrophe. This description of the flood hero as a visionary had its parallel in both Atra-Hasis and Berossos' version of the Flood story when the flood hero is warned in a dream." Kvanvig, 242.

[46] Cf. Gen 6:8 and *Jub.* 5:5—"He was pleased with Noah alone." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.33.

Nir, who assists him during the troubles with Sothonim and Melchizedek. While Nir is a priest surrounded by crowds of people, Noah is a timid relative whose activities are confined to the circle of his family. After Melchizedek's situation was settled, Noah quietly "went away to his own place."[47]

In contrast to this modest role of Noah, Methuselah and Nir are pictured as priests of the Lord who have dreams/visions in which the Lord gives them important instructions about priestly successions and future events. It sharply contrasts with the absence of any indication of the direct revelations of the Lord to Noah.[48] We therefore learn about the Flood and Noah's role in it from Methuselah[49] and Nir's dreams.

In *2 Enoch* chapter 70 the Lord appears to Methuselah in a night vision. The Lord tells him that the earth will perish but Noah, the first-born son of his son Lamech, will be preserved in order that "another world rise up from his seed."[50] The account of the Lord's revelation to Methuselah about the Flood and Noah in *2 Enoch* 70:4–10 might belong to the "original" Noachic tradition. It shows some similarities to the account of Enoch's revelation to Methuselah in *1 Enoch* 106:15–19. The affinities, however, should not be exaggerated.

A symmetrical parallel to Methuselah's dream in *2 Enoch* 70:4–10 is Nir's night vision in 71:27–30. In this short dream, which also describes in almost identical terms[51] the future destruction of the earth, one important detail is missing. Noah is absent from this revelation,[52] and

---

[47] Andersen, 206–207.

[48] *2 Enoch* 73, which attests to such a revelation, is a later interpolation represented only by the manuscript *R* and partly (only one line) by *Rum.* Cf. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.80 and 1.155. Our analysis of anti-Noachic polemics strengthens the hypothesis that *2 Enoch* 73 is a later addition, foreign to the original body of the text. For the discussion about chapter 73, see Vaillant, xxii; Andersen, 212.

[49] The motif of these divine/angelic revelations to Melthuselah parallels *1 Enoch* 106, 1QapGen 2:19 and to the text of Pseudo-Eupolemus where "Methuselah … learned all things through the help of the angels of God, and thus we gained our knowledge." Carl Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (4 vols,; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1983), 1.175.

[50] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 203.

[51] For example, see in the manuscript *R*: *2 Enoch* 70:8—"everything that stands will perish" (**и погꙑбнѣ всѧ ставленіе**) and *2 Enoch* 71:27—"everything that stands on the earth will perish" (**и погꙑбнетъ вьсѣко ставленіе земно**). Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo," 1.69 and 1.75.

[52] It is clear that Noah's name was purged from the original Noachic account which lies behind Nir's vision. The additional supporting detail here is that right after Nir's vision, when he arose from the sleep, he repeats the vision in his own words. In this

his place is now occupied by Melchizedek, who according to the Lord will not perish during the Flood but will be the head of the priests in the future.[53] This revision which substitutes one surviver of the Flood for another fits perfectly in the pattern of anti-Noachic polemics of the *Slavonic Enoch*. The important role of Noah as the "bridge" between the antediluvian and postdiluvian worlds is openly challenged.

Noah as a Bridge over the Flood

M. Stone stresses that "the sudden clustering of works around Noah indicates that he was seen as a pivotal figure in the history of humanity, as both an end and a beginning."[54] He also points out that the Pseudepigrapha from Qumran, which ascribe the priestly teaching to Noah, stress Noah's role as the "bridge" between the ante- and postdiluvian worlds.[55]

In the Pseudepigrapha Noah carries the priestly tradition through the Flood. *Jub*. pictures Noah and his sons as priests. Targumic and rabbinic traditions also attest to the priestly functions of Noah's family. The canonical emphasis on the role of Noah in the sacrificial practice has been mentioned earlier.

In *2 Enoch*, however, this function of Noah as a vessel of the priestly tradition over the Flood[56] is seriously undermined by Melchizedek—the child predestined to survive the Flood in order to become the priest to all priests in the postdiluvian generation. This story is repeated

---

repetition Nir mentions both Melchizedek and Noah as survivors of the Flood. It is apparent that we have here two different traditions which sometimes do not reconcile with each other. Cf. "And Melchizedek will be the head of the priests in another generation. For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation" 71:33–37. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 209.

[53] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 208.

[54] Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 141.

[55] Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 143.

[56] Another challenge to Noah's role as a carrier of antediluvian traditions over the Flood is the theme of Enoch's books. From *2 Enoch* 33:8–12 we learn that the Lord commanded his angels Arioch and Marioch to guard Enoch's books, so "they might not perish in the impending flood." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 157. This motif of the "secret" books by which antediluvian wisdom reached postdiluvian generations plays a prominent role in the Mesopotamian flood stories. Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 9–13.

in the text several times during the Lord's revelations to Nir and to archangel Gabriel.[57]

In chapter 71 the Lord appeared to Nir in a night vision. He tells Nir that the child Melchizedek will be placed by the archangel in the paradise of Eden where he can survive the destruction of the earth in order to become the priest to all priests after the Flood.[58] Further, in chapter 72 the Lord commands his archangel Gabriel to take Melchizedek and place him in the paradise for preservation, so that he becomes "the head of the priests" in the postdiluvian generation.[59]

In the midst of the anti-Noachic polemic, Noah himself recognizes the future priesthood of Melchizedek and surrenders his own and his descendents' priestly right to this child. From 71:20–21 we learn that when Noah saw the child Melchizedek with the badge of priesthood on his chest, he said to Nir: "Behold, God is renewing the continuation of the blood of the priesthood after us."[60]

The Birth of Noah

It has been shown that in the course of anti-Noachic polemics, the elements of Noah's story are transformed and his traditional roles are given to other characters. It is therefore no surprise to see that some details of Noah's birth in *2 Enoch* are transferred to a new hero—the future postdiluvian priest, Melchizedek.

The birth of Noah occupies an important place in the Noachic traditions. In *1 Enoch* 106–107 and in the *Genesis Apocryphon* 2–5, Noah is portrayed as a wonder-child. *1 Enoch* pictures him with a glorious face and eyes like the rays of the sun. He was born fully developed; and as he was taken away from the hand of the midwife, he spoke to the Lord. These extraordinary qualities of the wonder-child lead his father Lamech to suspect that Noah's birth was angelic in origin.

---

[57] This story is supported by the lenghty priestly geneology which also includes Enoch, Methuselah, and Nir. Noah, of course, is not presented in this list: "Therefore honor him (Melchizedek) together with your servants and great priests, with Sit, and Enos, and Rusi, and Amilam, and Prasidam, and Maleleil, and Serokh, and Arusan, and Aleem, and Enoch, and Methusalam, and me, your servant Nir. And behold, Melchizedek will be the head of the 13 priests who existed before" 71:32–33. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 208.

[58] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 208–209.

[59] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 211.

[60] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 207.

In the context of anti-Noachic polemics of *2 Enoch*, this prominent part of Noah's biography finds its new niche. Here again we have the polemical rewriting of the Noachic narrative when the peculiar details of Noah's story are transferred to an another character, namely, to Melchizedek.

Scholars noted previously that Melchizedek's birth in *Slavonic Enoch* recalls some parallels with the birth of Noah in *1 Enoch* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.[61] The Melchizedek narrative occupies the last chapters of *2 Enoch*. The content of the story is connected with the family of Nir. Sothonim, the wife of Nir, gave birth to a miraculous child "in her old age," right "on the day of her death." She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband." The book tells that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him before the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy. On the day she was to give birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him, and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchizedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. The unusual child was marked by the sign of priesthood. The story describes how "the badge of priesthood" was on his chest, glorious in appearance. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in "the paradise Eden," so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of

---

[61] Cf. M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 129; *idem*, "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave," *Kecharitomene. Mélanges René Laurentin* (ed. C. Augustin *et al.*; Paris: Desclée, 1990), 217–229; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 185; A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (4 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Christiandad, 1984), 4.199; R. Stichel, *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau. Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (AAWG.PH 3. Folge 112; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 42–54.

the short recension describe the ascent of Melchizedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

The details of Noah's birth correspond at several points with the Melchizedek story:

1. Both Noah and Melchizedek belonged to the circle of Enoch's family.

2. Both characters are attested as "survivors" of the Flood.

3. Both characters have an important mission in the postdiluvian era.

4. Both characters are pictured as glorious wonder children.

5. Immediately after their birth, both characters spoke to the Lord. *1 Enoch* 106:3—"And when he (Noah) arose from the hands of the midwife, he opened his mouth and spoke to the Lord with righteousness." *2 Enoch* 71:19—"he (Melchizedek) spoke with his lips, and he blessed the Lord."[62]

6. Both characters were suspected of divine/angelic lineage.

M. Delcor affirms that Lamech's phrase in the beginning of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, "Behold, then I thought in my heart that the conception was the work of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones …" can be compared with the words of Noah in *2 Enoch* uttered at the time of the examination of Melchizedek: "This is of the Lord, my brother."[63]

7. Their fathers were suspicious of the conception of their sons and the faithfulness of their wives.[64]

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Lamech is worried and "frightened" about the birth of Noah, his son. Lamech suspects that his wife Bathenosh was unfaithful to him and that "the conception was (the work) of the

---

[62] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 207.

[63] Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," 129.

[64] George Nickelsburg observes that the miraculous circumstances attending Melchizedek's conception and birth are reminiscent of the Noah story in *1 Enoch*, although the suspicion of Nir is more closely paralleled in the version of the Noah story in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 188.

Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephil[in]."[65] The motif of Lamech's suspicion about the unfaithfulness of Bathenosh found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* seems to correspond to Nir's worry about the unfaithfulness of Sothonim: "And Nir saw her, and he became very ashamed about her. And he said to her, 'what is this that you have done, O wife? And why have you disgraced me in the front of the face of all people? And now, depart from me, go where you conceived the disgrace of your womb.'"[66]

8. Their mothers were ashamed and tried to defend themselves against the accusation of their husbands.

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the wife of Lamech responds to the angry questions of her husband by reminding him of their intimacies: "Oh my brother and lord! remember my sexual pleasure… […] in the heat of intercourse, and the gasping of my breath in my breast."[67] She swears that the seed was indeed of Lamech: "I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of the hea[vens…]…[…] that this seed comes from you, […] and not from any foreigner nor from any of the watchers or sons of heav[en]."[68] In *2 Enoch* Sothonim does not explain the circumstances of the conception. She answers Nir: "O my lord! Behold, it is the time of my old age, and there was not in me any (ardor of) youth and I do not know how the indecency of my womb has been conceived."[69]

9. Their fathers were eventually comforted by the special revelation about the prominent future role of their sons in the postdiluvian era.

It is noteworthy that this information is given in both cases in the context of the revelation about the destruction of the earth by the Flood.

1 Enoch 106:16–18—"And this son who has been born unto you shall be left upon the earth, and his three sons shall be saved when they who are upon the earth are dead."

---

[65] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.29.

[66] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 205.

[67] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.29.

[68] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.29–31.

[69] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 205.

2 Enoch 71:29–30—"And this child will not perish along with those who are perishing in this generation, as I have revealed it, so that Melchizedek will be… the head of the priests of the future."[70]

One cannot fail to note a host of interesting overlaps between the birth of Noah in the Pseudepigrapha and the birth of Melchizedek in *2 Enoch*. It is not difficult to notice that the author of *2 Enoch* wants to diminish the extraordinariness of Noah's person and transfer these qualities to Melchizedek. The text therefore can be seen as a set of improvisations on the original Noachic themes.

Noah's Son

Shem b. Noah plays a prominent role in Noachic traditions.[71] According to *Jubilees*, Shem is Noah's choice in the transmission of his teaching. From *Jub.* 10:13–14 we learn that "Noah wrote down in a book everything … and he gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons."[72] Because of his unique role in the Noachic tradition, Shem b. Noah is also one of the targets of the anti-Noachic polemics of *2 Enoch*. This debate takes its place in the last chapters of the book which are connected with the Melchizedek legend.

The previous exposition shows that the Melchizedek story is closely connected with Nir's family. Even though Nir is not the biological father of Melchizedek, he later adopts him as his son. In *2 Enoch* chapter 71 Nir says to the Lord: "For I have no descendants, so let this child take the place of my descendants and become as my own son, and you will count him in the number of your servants."[73] In this instance of Nir's "adoption" of Melchizedek we have again an anti-Noachic motif.

In targumic and rabbinic literature Melchizedek is often attested as the oldest son of Noah—Shem. The identification of Melchizedek and Shem can be found in *Tg. Ps.-J.*, *Frg. Tg.*, *Tg. Neof.*, *Gen. Rab.* 43.1; 44.7, *Abot R. Nat.* 2, *Pirke R. El.* 7; 27, and *b.* Ned. 32b.

---

[70] Andersen, '2 Enoch," 208.

[71] On Shem traditions in *2 Enoch* see: A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38.

[72] VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

[73] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 209.

The basic message of the passages from the Targums and rabbinic literature is the building up of the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek (Shem) in the context of the transmission of this priestly line to Abraham.[74] In these texts Shem b. Noah (Melchizedek) represents an important link in the passing of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition to Abraham. This prominent motif of the succession of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition by the tradition of Abraham and his descendants, including Isaac and Levi, can be found already in *Jub.* 21 and in the Levi document from Athos.

In contrast, the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* attempts to build an alternative to the traditional targumic/rabbinic line of interpretation, which serves as a parallel to the official Noah-Shem line. Previously unknown Nir, the young brother of Noah, plays an important theological role in this shift. The substitution of Noah's "fatherhood" to Nir's "fatherhood" is one more facet of the complicated anti-Noachic polemics in the text of *2 Enoch.*

Conclusion

The goal of our research was to show the existence of anti-Noachic polemics in 2 Enoch. To understand the reasons for the suppression of the Noahic traditions in the text would require another lengthy investigation. However, some conclusions can be made at this stage of the research.

---

[74] Cf. for example *b.* Ned. 32b: "R. Zechariah said on R. Ishmael's authority: The Holy One, blessed be He, intended to bring forth the priesthood from Shem, as it is written, 'And he [Melchizedek] was the priest of the most high God' (Gen 14:18). But because he gave precedence in his blessing to Abraham over God, He brought it forth from Abraham; as it is written, 'And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, and blessed be the most high God' (Gen 14:19). Said Abraham to him, 'Is the blessing of a servant to be given precedence over that of his master?' Straightway it [the priesthood] was given to Abraham, as it is written (Ps. 110:1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;' which is followed by, 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek' (Ps. 110:4), meaning, 'because of the word of Melchizedek.' Hence it is written, And he was a priest of the most High God, [implying that] he was a priest, but not his seed." *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nedarim* (London: Soncino, 1936), 98–99.

1. The foregoing survey testifies to the existence of anti-Noachic polemics in *2 Enoch*. The analysis shows that these polemics seem to be based on the "original" Noachic materials which demonstrate some distant parallels with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* found in *1 Enoch*, *Jub.*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.[75]

2. The anti-Noachic debates involve a substantial rewriting of the "original" Noachic motifs and themes. The details of the Noah "biography" are rearranged and transferred to other characters, including Methuselah, Nir, and Melchizedek.

3. It appears that the main target of the anti-Noachic polemics is the Noah–Abraham priestly connection. It explains why Melchizedek (who in targumic/rabbinic traditions represents the important link in the passing of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition to Abraham) becomes the center of the fierce anti-Noachic debates in *2 Enoch*. The fact that Abraham and his progeny are completely absent in *2 Enoch* further supports the hypothesis. In this Slavonic apocalypse the Lord is named as "God of your father Enoch"[76]—the familiar title which in the Bible is connected with Abraham and his descendants.

4. The anti-Noachic polemics could be also triggered by the prominence of the Adamic tradition in the *Slavonic Enoch*,[77] where "the high priesthood is traced back ultimately to Adam."[78] In the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran writings, the Adamic and Priestly—Noah traditions often compete with and suppress each other. In the Adamic tradition, the source of evil is traced to the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. In contrast to that, the Noachic tradition bases its understanding of the origin

---

[75] It is possible that some traces of the polemics with Noachic tradition can be found already in early Enochic documents, including bookletes of *1 Enoch*, where Enoch often "substitutes" Noah in Noachic narratives. Such tensions between Enoch and Noah can be rooted in certain Mesopotamian "prototypes" common for both characters. Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 189–191.

[76] Cf. *2 Enoch* 69:2, 69:5, and 70:3—"I am the Lord, the God of your father Enoch" (**Богъ отца твоего Єноха**).

[77] On the Adamic traditions in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha and *2 Enoch* see: Émile Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de L'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 405–435; C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995).

[78] Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 148.

of the evil on the Watchers story. In this story the descended Watchers corrupt human beings by passing to them various celestial secrets. By those mysteries the humans multiply evil deads upon the earth.[79] This Noachic motif seems to be challenged in *2 Enoch*, where the Lord keeps His utmost secrets from the angels.[80]

5. It is evident that *2 Enoch* contains a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the Noachic tradition. These anti-Noachic revisions take place in the midst of the sectarian debates about the sacrificial practice and the priestly succession.[81]

[79] *1 Enoch* 16:3.

[80] Cf. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 143.

[81] As A. Rubinstein notes, "it is hard to escape the impression that the purpose of the account is to build up the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek." A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *JJS* 15 (1962) 5. P. Sacchi adds that the Melchizedek story gives "the impression of a work that developes an Enochic priestly tradition in the midst of the problems of first-century Jewish thought, with particular reference to the relation between the function of Enoch and those of Melchizedek." P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 234–235.

NOAH'S YOUNGER BROTHER REVISITED: ANTI-NOACHIC POLEMICS AND THE DATE OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Several years ago, in an article published in the *Henoch*, I argued that *2 Enoch* contains systematic polemics against the priestly Noachic tradition.[1] My study tried to demonstrate that in the course of these polemics the exalted features of Noah's story, such as his miraculous birth, his leading roles as the originator of animal sacrificial practice and a bridge over the Flood become transferred to other characters of the Slavonic apocalypse including Methuselah, Nir, who defined in the story as "Noah's younger brother," and his miraculously born child Melchizedek.[2] The analysis showed that the transferences of Noah's

[1] A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.

[2] Noachic polemics take place in the last chapters of the Slavonic apocalypse (chs 68–72). In this section of the pseudepigraphon we learn that, immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Achuzan, the place where Enoch had been taken up. In *2 Enoch* 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him as priest before the people. Verses 11–16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, "in the required manner," sheep and oxen placed at the head of the altar. All these sheep and oxen are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. Chapter 70 of *2 Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, the previously unknown Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's firstborn son), even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood before the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar." The account of the sacerdotal practices of Enoch's relatives then continues with the Melchizedek story. The content of the story is connected with Nir's family. Sothonim, Nir's wife, gave birth to a child "in her old age," right "on the day of her death." She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband." The book narrated that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid

features and achievements to other characters were intended to diminish the extraordinary role traditionally assigned to the hero of the Flood in the crucial juncture of the primeval history.

While demonstrating the existence of the Noahic polemics my previous study did not fully explain the purpose of these polemics. Why did Noah, who traditionally is viewed as the main ally of the seventh antedeluvian hero in the early Enochic booklets, suddenly become devalued by the Enochic tradition? In this current investigation I will try to advance an argument that the polemics with the exalted figure of the hero of the Flood found in *2 Enoch* might represent the response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges posed to the classic profile of the seventh antediluvian hero by the Second Temple mediatorial traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets.

A further and more important goal of this study will be clarification of the possible date of *2 Enoch*, which represents a crucial problem for the students of the Slavonic apocalypse who often lament the absence of unambiguous textual evidence that can place the pseudepigraphon in the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism. Scholars have rightly observed that "although many commentators take for granted a date as early as the first century CE for *2 Enoch*, the fact remains that it survives only in medieval manuscripts in Slavonic and that exegesis of it needs to commence at that point and proceed backwards to a putative (and highly debatable) first-century Jewish original only on the basis of rigorous argument."[3]

---

herself during all the days of her pregnancy. Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchizedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. According to the story, the newborn child was marked with the sacerdotal sign, the glorious "badge of priesthood" on his chest. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and they fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in "the paradise Eden" so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of the story describe the ascent of Melchizedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

[3] J.R. Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 261, n. 20.

It is possible that the anti-Noachic developments found in the Slavonic apocalypse can finally provide the decisive proof for the early date of this text. The investigation will explore whether Noachic polemical developments, which focus on the issues of sacrificial practices and priestly successions, can be firmly dated not later than 70 CE, since they reflect a distinctive sacerdotal situation peculiar to the time when the Temple was still standing. This study will try to demonstrate that the Noachic polemics in *2 Enoch* belong to the same stream of early Enochic testimonies to the priestly-Noah tradition as those reflected in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, written before the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple.

Purpose of the Polemics

My study published in *Henoch*[4] demonstrated that *2 Enoch* shows a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the figure of Noah. These revisions take place in the midst of the debates about sacrificial practice and priestly succession. But what is the role of this denigration of the hero of the Flood and the traditions associated with his name in the larger framework of the mediatorial polemical interactions found in the Slavonic apocalypse?

I have argued elsewhere that the anti-Noachic developments is not the only polemical trend found in the Slavonic apocalypse.[5] In fact *2 Enoch* reveals an intricate web of mediatorial debates in the course of which the several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in Second Temple Judaism, including Adam and Moses, underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features are transferred to the seventh antediluvian hero. These polemical tendencies seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial debates widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in *2 Enoch* is part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges of its rivals.

---

[4] A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.

[5] A. Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303; *idem*, "'Without Measure and Without Analogy:' The tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56.2 (2005) 224–244.

It has been mentioned that *2 Enoch* contains polemics with Adamic and Mosaic traditions. These polemical moves are consistent with the ambiguous attitude towards Adam and Moses already discernable in the earliest Enochic materials where these two exalted characters traditionally understood as the major mediatorial rivals of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.[6] But why do the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse attempt to diminish the significance of Noah, who was traditionally considered as a main ally of the seventh antediluvian patriarch and, consequently, occupied a prominent place among the main heroes of the Enochic lore starting from the earliest Enochic booklets?

The important feature of the removal of Noah's priestly and sacrificial roles in *2 Enoch* is that, although the significance of the hero of the flood is almost completely sacerdotally denigrated, it does not affect or destroy the value or meaning of the alternative priestly tradition which he was faithfully representing for such a long time. The legacy of this priestly-sacrificial office is still strictly maintained within the Enochic family since Noah's priestly garments are not lost or destroyed but instead are skillfully transferred to other kinsmen of the Enochic clan, including its traditional member Methuselah[7] and two other, newly-acquired relatives, Nir[8] and Melchizedek.[9]

This shows that the impetus for the denigration of Noah, this important character of the Enochic-Noachic axis, does not come from opponents to the Enochic tradition, but rather originates within this lore. It represents a domestic conflict that attempts to downgrade and devalue the former paladin who has become so notable that his exalted status in the context of mediatorial interactions now poses an imminent threat to the main hero of the Enochic tradition. It is noteworthy that in the course of the aforementioned polemical transferences, the priestly profile of Enoch and the sacerdotal status of some members of his immediate family become much stronger. His son Methuselah, the first-born

---

[6] See: J. VanderKam, "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in: *The Bible at Qumran* (eds. P.W. Flint and T.H. Kim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 142; P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 100; *idem*, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel *et al.*, BETL, CLIX; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 234; Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," 276–277.

[7] Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," 209.

[8] Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," 210.

[9] Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," 216ff.

and heir of his father's teaching, has now acquired the roles of high priest and pioneer of animal sacrificial practice by constructing an altar on the high place associated with the Jerusalem Temple.[10] Further, it should not be forgotten that the priest Nir is also a member of Enoch's family, so the future priest Melchizedek, who despite the fact of his bizarre fatherless birth, is nevertheless safely brought into the circle of Enoch's family through his adoption by Nir.[11] The priestly succession from Enoch and Methuselah to Shem-Melchizedek, an important carrier of sacrificial precepts, thus occurs without the help of Noah. Moreover this enigmatic heir of Enoch's priestly tradition is then able to survive the Deluge not in the ark of the hero of the Flood, but through translation, like Enoch, to heaven.

Enoch also seems to have benefited from Noah's removal from priestly and sacrificial duties since this has made him the only remaining authority in sacrificial instruction, an office that he shared previously with Noah.[12] This fact might have encouraged him to openly deliver a series of sacrificial halakhot to his children that he never did previously in the Enochic materials.[13]

It is also significant that, although the priestly profile of Noah is removed in the text and his elevated qualities are transferred to other characters, he still remains a faithful member of the Enochic clan. Although he ceases to be an extraordinary figure and peacefully surrenders his prominent offices to his relatives, he still manages to perfectly fit in the family surroundings by virtue of his newly acquired role of an average person and a family helper in the new plot offered by 2 *Enoch*'s authors.[14] This depiction of Noah as an ordinary person provides an important key for understanding the main objective of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse as an argument against the exalted profile of the hero of the Flood posing as a mediatorial rival of Enoch.

---

[10] *2 Enoch* 68–69. F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.196–199.

[11] In *2 Enoch* 71 Nir says to the Lord: "For I have no descendants, so let this child take the place of my descendants and become as my own son, and you will count him in the number of your servants." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 209.

[12] Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," 210–212.

[13] *2 Enoch* 59. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 184–187.

[14] In *2 Enoch* 71, Noah is depicted as a timid relative whose activities are confined to the circle of his family. After Melchizedek's situation was settled, Noah quietly "went away to his own place." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 206–207.

The changing attitude toward Noah as a potential threat to Enoch's exalted role might already be detected in the late Second Temple Enochic developments. A tradition preserved in the Ethiopic text of the *Animal Apocalypse*[15] portrays Noah with imagery identical to that used in the portrayal of Moses in the Aramaic and Ethiopic versions of the text, that is, as an animal transformed into a human; in the zoomorphic code of the book this metamorphosis signifies the transformation into an angelomorphic creature. The Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* do not attest to the tradition of Noah's elevation, which suggests that this tradition was a later Second Temple development.[16] It might indicate that in the later Second Temple Enochic lore, about the time when *2 Enoch* was written, Noah was understood as an angelomorphic creature similar to Moses, thus posing a potential threat to the elevated profile of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Debates about the Date

The foregoing analysis of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse points to the complex process of interaction between the various mediatorial streams competing for the primacy of their heroes. Yet these conceptual engagements allow us not only to gain a clearer view of the enhancement of Enoch's elevated profile but also to determine a possible date for the text.

Students of Jewish pseudepigrapha have previously raised concerns about the date of the Slavonic apocalypse, pointing to the fact that the text does not seem to supply definitive evidence for placing it within precise chronological boundaries.

It should be noted that the scholarly attitude towards the Slavonic apocalypse as evidence of Second Temple Jewish developments remains somewhat ambiguous in view of the uncertainty of the text's date. Although students of the apocalypse working closely with the text insist on the early date of the Jewish pseudepigraphon, a broader scholarly community has been somehow reluctant to fully embrace *2 Enoch* as a Second Temple Jewish text.[17] In scholarly debates about the Sec-

[15] *1 Enoch* 89:9.

[16] P. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (EJL, 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 267.

[17] The early date of the pseudepigraphon was supported by, among others, the fol-

ond Temple pseudepigrapha, one can often find references to Francis Andersen's remark that "in every respect *2 Enoch* remains an enigma. So long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes."[18]

The uncritical use of this brief statement about *2 Enoch* as an enigma "in every respect" unfortunately tends to oversimplify the scholarly situation and diminish the value of the long and complex history of efforts to clarify the provenance and date the text.[19] The following brief excursus into the history of arguments against the early date of the text demonstrates the extreme rarity of critical attempts and their very limited power of persuasion.

1. In 1896, in his introduction to the English translation of *2 Enoch*, R.H. Charles assigned "with reasonable certainty" the composition

---

lowing investigations: R.H. Charles and W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 165; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG.PH Neue Folge Bd.1 Nr.3; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); N. Schmidt, "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *JAOS* 41 (1921) 307–312; G. Scholem, *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (SJ, 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), 62–64; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in: *Religions en Egypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109–116; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in: *Types of Redemption* (eds. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87; J.C. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973), xviii–xx; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 38–41; J.H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323; J.J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck,1983), 533; F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), 1.91–221; M.E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 406; A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del AT* (4 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Christiandad, 1984), 4.147–202; C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ, 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995), 812–813. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

[18] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 97.

[19] After all it should not be forgotten that in the same study Francis Andersen explicitly assigns the book to the late first century CE. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 91.

of the text to the period between 1–50 CE,[20] before the destruction of the Temple; this view, however, did not remain unchallenged.[21] In 1918 the British astronomer A.S.D. Maunder launched an attack against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon, arguing that the Slavonic Enoch does not represent an early Jewish text written in the first century CE, but instead is "a specimen of Bogomil propaganda," composed in the Slavonic language in "the 'Middle Bulgarian' period—i.e., between the 12th and 15th centuries."[22] In the attempt to justify her claim, Maunder appealed to the theological content of the book, specifically to its alleged Bogomil features, such as the dualism of good and evil powers. She found that such dualistic ideas were consistent with the sectarian teaching that "God had two sons, Satanail and Michael."[23] Maunder's study was not limited solely to the analysis of the theological features of the text but also included a summary of the astronomical and calendarical observations which attempted to prove a late date for the text. Her argument against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon was later supported by J.K. Fotheringham, who offered a less radical hypothesis that the date of *2 Enoch* must be no earlier than the middle of the seventh century CE.[24]

Scholars have noted that Maunder's argumentation tends to underestimate the theological and literary complexities of the Slavonic Enoch. The remark was made that, after reading Maunder's article, one can be "astonished at the weakness of this argument and at the

[20] In his introduction to the Forbes' translation of *2 Enoch* in *APOT*, Charles broadened the range of the dating of the apocalypse, postulating that "*2 Enoch* in its present form was written probably between 30 B.C. and A.D. 70. It was written after 30 B.C., for it makes use of *Sirach*, *1 Enoch*, and the *Book of Wisdom*…, and before A.D. 70; for the temple is still standing." R.H. Charles and N. Forbes, "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; ed. R.H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 2. 429. This opinion about the early date of *2 Enoch* was also supported by Charles' contemporaries, the Russian philologist Matvej Sokolov and German theologian Nathaniel Bonwetsch. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo;" Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch*; *idem*, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs*.

[21] R.H. Charles and W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), xxvi.

[22] A.S.D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316, esp. 316.

[23] Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," 315.

[24] J.K. Fotheringham, "The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 20 (1919) 252.

irrelevant matters adduced in support of it."[25] Charles responded to the criticism of Maunder and Fotheringham in his article published in 1921 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in which he pointed out, among other things, that "the Slavonic Enoch, which ascribes the entire creation to God and quotes the Law as divine, could not have emanated from the Bogomils."[26]

2. Another attempt to question the scholarly consensus about the early date of *2 Enoch* was made by Jósef Milik in his introduction to the edition of the Qumran fragments of the Enochic books published in 1976.[27] In the introductory section devoted to the Slavonic Enoch, Milik proposed that the apocalypse was composed between the ninth and tenth centuries CE by a Byzantine Christian monk who knew the Enochic Pentateuch "in the form with which we are familiar through the Ethiopic version."[28] In order to support his hypothesis of a late date Milik draws attention to several lexical features of the text. One of them is the Slavonic word **змоурениемь** (*zmureniem*')[29] found in *2 Enoch* 22:11 which Milik has traced to the Greek term συρμαιόγραφος,[30] a derivative of the verb συρμαιογραφεῖν, translated as "to write in minuscule, hence quickly."[31] He argues that this verb appears to be a neologism which is not attested in any Greek text before the beginning of the ninth century. In addition in his analysis of the lexical features of the apocalypse, Milik directed attention to the angelic names of Arioch and Marioch found in *2 Enoch* 33, arguing that they represent the equivalents of the

[25] A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21, esp. 3.

[26] R.H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 162–163. See also K. Lake, "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398.

[27] J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

[28] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 109.

[29] Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.23, footnote 13.

[30] Milik's hypothesis is implausible. Most scholars trace the word **змоурениемь** (*zmureniem*') to the Slavonic **змоурьна** (*zmur'na*) which corresponds to σμύρνα, *myrrha*. J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae)* (4 vols.; Prague, 1958–1992), 1.677–678. Andersen's translation renders the relevant part of *2 Enoch* 22:11 as follows: "And Vereveil hurried and brought me the books mottled with myrrh." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 141.

[31] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 111.

Harut and Marut of the Muslim legends attested in the second sura of the Qur'an.[32]

John Collins, among others, has offered criticism of Milik's lexical arguments, noting that even if the Slavonic text uses the Greek word συρμαιόγραφος, "a single word in the translation is not an adequate basis for dating the whole work."[33] He has also pointed out that "the alleged correspondence of the angels Arioch and Marioch to Harut and Marut of Muslim legend is indecisive since the origin of these figures has not been established."[34]

Milik's arguments were not confined only to the lexical features of the apocalypse. He also argued that the priestly succession from Methuselah to Noah's nephew Melchizedek described in the third part of *2 Enoch* reflects "the transmission of monastic vocations from uncle to nephew, the very widespread custom in the Greek Church during the Byzantine and medieval periods."[35] This feature in his opinion also points to the late Byzantine date of the pseudepigraphon. Unfortunately Milik was unaware of the polemical nature of the priestly successions detailed in the Slavonic Enoch and did not understand the actual role of Nir and Melchizedek in the polemical exposition of the story.

It should be noted that Milik's insistence on the Byzantine Christian provenance of the Slavonic apocalypse was partially inspired by the earlier research of the French Slavist André Vaillant who argued for the Christian authorship of the text.[36] Vaillant's position too generated substantial critical response since the vast majority of readers of *2 Enoch* had been arguing for the Jewish provenance of the original core of the text.[37]

---

[32] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 110.

[33] J.J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983), 533, n. 7.

[34] Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," 533, note 7.

[35] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114.

[36] A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4; Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1976 [1952]).

[37] Some of the supporters of the idea of the Jewish authorship of the text include the following scholars: Amusin, Andersen, Bonwetsch, Böttrich, Bousset, Charles, Charlesworth, Collins, De Conick, Delcor, Denis, Eissfeldt, Ginzberg, Gieschen, Greenfield, Gruenwald, Fletcher-Louis, Fossum, Harnak, Himmelfarb, Kahana, Kamlah, Mach, Meshcherskij, Odeberg, Pines, Philonenko, Riessler, Sacchi, Segal, Sokolov, de Santos Otero, Schmidt, Scholem, Schürer, Stichel, Stone, and Székely.

The foregoing analysis of the arguments against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon demonstrates how scanty and unsubstantiated they were in the sea of the overwhelming positive consensus. It also shows that none of these hypotheses has been able to stand up to criticism and to form a rationale that would constitute a viable counterpart to the scholarly opinion supporting the early date. Still, one should recognize that, while the adoption of an early date for the text itself does not face great challenges, placing the text within the precise boundaries of Second Temple Judaism is a much more difficult task.

In proceeding to this task one must first understand what features of the text point to the early date of the text in the chronological framework of Second Temple Judaism. It is noteworthy that the vast majority of scholarly efforts have been in this respect directed towards finding possible hints that might somehow indicate that the Temple was still standing when the original text was composed.[38] Thus, scholars have previously noted that the text does not seem to hint that the catastrophe of the destruction of the Temple has already occurred at the time of its composition. Critical readers of the pseudepigraphon would have some difficulties finding any explicit expression of feelings of sadness or mourning about the loss of the sanctuary.

The affirmations of the value of the animal sacrificial practices and Enoch's halakhic instructions also appear to be fashioned not in the "preservationist," mishnaic-like mode of expression, but rather as if they reflected sacrificial practices that still existed when the author was writing his book.[39] There is also an intensive and consistent effort on the part of the author to legitimize the central place of worship, which through the reference to the place *Achuzan* (a cryptic name for the temple mountain in Jerusalem), is transparently connected in *2 Enoch* with the Jerusalem Temple.[40] Scholars have also previously noted that there are some indications in the text of the ongoing practice of pilgrimage to the central place of worship; these indications could be expected in a text written in the Alexandrian Diaspora.[41] Thus, in his instructions to the children, Enoch repeatedly encourages them to bring the gifts before the face of God for the remission of sins, a practice which

[38] U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 40–41; Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 812–813.

[39] *2 Enoch* 59.

[40] In Ezek 48:20–21 the Hebrew word אחזה "special property of God" is applied to Jerusalem and the Temple. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114.

[41] Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

appears to recall well-known sacrificial customs widespread in the Second Temple period.[42] Moreover, the Slavonic apocalypse also contains a direct command to visit the Temple three times a day, advice that would be difficult to fulfill if the sanctuary has already been destroyed.[43]

One can see that the crucial arguments for the early dating of the text are all linked to the themes of the Sanctuary and its ongoing practices and customs. These discussions are not new; even Charles employed the references to the Temple practices found in the Slavonic apocalypse as main proofs for his hypothesis of the early date of the apocalypse. Since Charles' pioneering research these arguments have been routinely reiterated by scholars.

Recently, however, Christfried Böttrich attempted to broaden the familiar range of argumentation by bringing to scholarly attention a description of the joyful celebration which in his opinion may fix the date of the apocalypse within the boundaries of the Second Temple period. In his introduction to his German translation of *2 Enoch* published in 1995, Böttrich draws attention to a tradition found in Chapter 69 of the Slavonic apocalypse which deals with the joyful festival marking Methuselah's priestly appointment and his animal sacrifices.[44] According to Böttrich's calculations, this cult-establishing event falls on the 17th of Tammuz, which in his opinion is identified in *2 Enoch* as the day of the summer solstice.[45] Böttrich links this solar event with the imagery found in *2 Enoch* 69, where Methuselah's face becomes radiant in front of the altar "like the sun at midday rising up." He then reminds us that, since the second century CE, the 17th of Tammuz was observed as a day of mourning and fasting because it was regarded as the day when Titus conquered Jerusalem.[46] Böttrich suggests that the description of the joyful festival in *2 Enoch* 69, which does not show any signs of sadness or mourning, indicates that the account and consequently the whole book were written before the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.[47]

---

[42] *2 Enoch* 61:1–5; *2 Enoch* 62:1–2.

[43] *2 Enoch* 51:4: "In the morning of the day and in the middle of the day and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord's temple on account of the glory of your creator." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 178.

[44] Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813. See also: C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 451.

[45] There are many discrepancies and contradictions in the calendarical data presented in the text.

[46] *y*. Ta^{c}an. 68c and *b*. Ta^{c}an. 26b.

[47] Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

Böttrich's observations are of interest, but his understanding of Chapter 69 and especially of the motif of the radiant face of Methuselah, pivotal for his argument, is problematic in light of the polemical developments detected in the Slavonic apocalypse. Böttrich is unaware of the Noachic polemics witnessed to by the Slavonic apocalypse and does not notice that the description of Methuselah as the originator of the animal sacrificial cult in *2 Enoch* 69 represents the polemical counterpart to Noah's role, who is portrayed in the Bible and the pseudepigrapha as the pioneer of animal sacrificial practice.[48] Methuselah, who has never been previously attested in Second Temple materials as the originator of sacrificial cult, thus openly supplants Noah, whose prominent role and elevated status the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse want to diminish. It has already been mentioned that in the course of the Noachic polemics, many exalted features of the hero of the Flood have been transferred to other characters of the book. One of these transferences includes the motif of the luminous face of Noah, the feature which the hero of the flood acquired at his birth.

As one might recall, the early Enochic materials portray Noah as a wonder child. *1 Enoch* 106,[49] the *Genesis Apocryphon*,[50] and possibly 1Q19[51] depict him with a glorious face and eyes "like the rays of the sun." *1 Enoch* 106:2 relates that when the new-born Noah opened his eyes, the whole house lit up. The child then opened his mouth and blessed the Lord of heaven. Scholars have previously noted[52] that the scene of the glorious visage of the young hero of the Flood delivering blessings

---

[48] M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 138.

[49] *1 Enoch* 106:5 "… his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious…" M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2.244–245.

[50] 1QapGen 5:12–13 "…his face has been lifted to me and his eyes shine like [the] s[un…] (of) this boy is flame and he…" F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.31.

[51] A similar tradition is reflected in 1Q19. 1Q19 3: "…were aston[ished …] [… (not like the children of men) the fir]st-born is born, but the glorious ones […] […] his father, and when Lamech saw […] […] the chambers of the house like the beams of the sun […] to frighten the […]." 1Q19 13: "[…] because the glory of your face […] for the glory of God in […] [… he will] be exalted in the splendor of the glory and the beauty […] he will be honored in the midst of […]." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.27.

[52] C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 33ff.

upon his rising up from the hands of the midwife has a sacerdotal significance and parallels the glorious appearance and actions of the high priest.[53] It manifests the portentous beginning of the priestly-Noah tradition.[54] The priestly features of Noah's natal account are important for discerning the proper meaning of the symbolism of Methuselah's luminous visage in *2 Enoch* 69.

In his analysis of the account, Böttrich recognizes that the description of Methuselah's radiant face alludes to the picture of the high priest Simon attested in Sirach 50:1–24. Still, Böttrich is unable to discern the Noachic meaning of this allusion. Meanwhile Fletcher-Louis clearly sees this Noachic link, demonstrating that Methuselah's radiant face in *2 Enoch* 69 is linked not only to Sirach 50:5–11 but also to *1 Enoch* 106:2[55] and 1Q19.[56] Sirach's description of the high priest Simon serves here as an intermediate link that elucidates the connection between Noah and Methuselah. All three characters are sharing the identical priestly imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes strong parallelism between Simon's description and the priestly features of the story of Noah. He observes that

> this description of Simon the high priest comes at the climax of a lengthy hymn in praise of Israel's heroes which had begun some six chapters earlier with (Enoch and) Noah (44:16–17), characters whose identity and purpose in salvation-history the high priest gathers up in his cultic office. Obviously, at the literal level Noah's birth in *1 Enoch* 106:2 takes place in the *private* house of his parents. However, I suggest the reader is meant to hear a deeper symbolic reference in that house to *the* house (cf. Sirach 50:1), the Temple, which Simon the high priest illuminates and glorifies. Just as Simon appears from behind the veil which marks the transition from heaven to earth and brings a numinous radiance to the realm of

---

[53] Crispin Fletcher-Louis notes parallels between this scene and the description of the ideal high priest from Sirach 50. He argues that "in Sirach 50 the liturgical procession through Simon's various ministrations climaxes with Aaron's blessings of the people (50:20, cf. Numbers 6) and a call for all the readers of Sirach's work 'to bless the God of all who everywhere works greater wonders, who fosters our growth from birth and deals with us according to his mercy' (50:22). So, too, in 1 Enoch 106:3 the infant Noah rises from the hands of the midwife and, already able to speak as an adult, 'he opened his mouth and blessed the Lord.'" Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 47.

[54] Fletcher-Louis argues that "the staging for [Noah's] birth and the behavior of the child have strongly priestly resonances." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

[55] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 50.

[56] He notes that the statement "I shall glorify you in front of the face of all the people, and you will be glorified all the days of your life" (*2 Enoch* 69:5) and the references to God "raising up" a priest for himself in 69:2,4 "is intriguingly reminiscent of 1Q19 13 lines 2–3." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 50.

> creation at worship, so Noah breaks forth from his mother's waters to illuminate the house of his birth.[57]

It has been mentioned that Böttrich points to the possible connection of the radiance of Methuselah's face to solar symbolism. Nevertheless, he fails to discern the proper meaning of such a connection, unable to recognize the Noachic background of the imagery. It is not coincidental that in the Noachic accounts the facial features of the hero of the Flood are linked to solar imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes the prominence of the solar symbolism in the description of Noah's countenance; his eyes are compared with "the rays of the sun." He suggests that "the solar imagery might ultimately derive from the Mesopotamian primeval history where the antediluvian hero is closely identified with the sun."[58] Yet in the Second Temple period such solar imagery has taken on distinctively priestly associations.[59]

In light of the aforementioned traditions, it is clear that Methuselah, who in *2 Enoch* 69 inherits Noah's priestly office is also assuming there the features of his appearance as a high priest, one of which is the radiant visage associated with solar symbolism. The radiant face of Methuselah in *2 Enoch* 69 thus represents a significant element of the polemics against the priestly Noachic tradition and its main character, whose facial features were often compared to the radiance of the sun.

Noachic Polemics and the Date of the Text

The analysis of the Noachic background of the priestly and sacrificial practices in *2 Enoch* leads us to the important question about the role of Noachic polemical developments in discerning the early date of the apocalypse. It is possible that the Noachic priestly polemics reflected in *2 Enoch* represent the most important and reliable testimony that the text was composed when the Second Temple was still standing.

The central evidence here is the priestly features of the miraculous birth of the hero. It has been already demonstrated that the main concern of the story of the wondrous birth was sacerdotal; the story is permeated with imagery portraying the newborn as the high priest *par excellence*. It also has been shown that the anti-Noachic priestly tradition

---

[57] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 47.
[58] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.
[59] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

reflected in *2 Enoch* is not separate from the Enochic-Noachic axis but belongs to the same set of conceptual developments reflected in such Second Temple Enochic and Noachic materials as *1 Enoch* 106, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and 1Q19.[60] The traditions prevalent in these accounts were reworked by the Enochic author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse in response to the new challenging circumstances of the mediatorial polemics. The priestly features of *2 Enoch's* account of the wondrous birth might thus point to the fact that this narrative and, as a consequence, the whole macroform to which it belongs was written in the Second Temple period. It should be emphasized again that the distinct chronological marker here is not the story of the wonder child itself, which was often imitated in later Jewish materials, but the priestly features of the story that are missing in these later improvisations.

The analysis of the later pseudepigraphic and rabbinic imitations of the account of Noah's birth shows that the priestly dimension of the story never transcended the boundaries of the Enochic-Noachic lore, nor did it cross the chronological boundary of 70CE since it remained relevant only within the sacerdotal context of the Second Temple Enochic-Noachic materials. Although some later Jewish authors were familiar with the account of Noah's birth, this story never again became the subject of priestly polemics once the dust of the destroyed Temple settled.

Several examples can illustrate this situation. In search of the later variants of the story of the wonder-child Fletcher-Louis draws attention to the account of Cain's birth in the primary Adam books.[61] Thus, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* 21:3 relates that Eve "brought forth a son who shone brilliantly (*lucidus*). At once the infant stood up and ran out and brought some grass with his own hands and gave it to his mother. His name was called Cain."[62] Fletcher-Louis points out that

---

[60] Fletcher-Louis suggests that the authors of *Jubilees* probably also knew the story of Noah's birth, since the text mentions his mother Bitenosh. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 35, n. 9.

[61] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 51–52.

[62] G.A. Anderson and M.E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (SBLEJL, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 24–24E. See also Armenian and Georgian versions of LAE: "Then, when she bore the child, the color of his body was like the color of stars. At the hour when the child fell into the hands of the midwife, he leaped up and, with his hands, plucked up the grass of the earth…" (Armenian). "Eve arose as the angel had instructed her: she gave birth to an infant and his color was like that of the stars. He fell into the hands of the midwife and (at once) he began to pluck up the grass.…" (Georgian). *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 24E.

this narrative of the wonder child recalls the story of Noah. Yet he notes that "all the features which in the birth of Noah signal the child's priestly identity—solar imagery, birth in a house and child's blessing of God are markedly absent in the Adamic story."[63] Such absence of the significant features can be an indication that the final form of the text was composed outside the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism and therefore, unlike *2 Enoch*, displays no interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the story. Although the authors of the Latin *LAE* might have been familiar with the narrative of Noah's birth, the priestly concerns associated with the story were no longer relevant for them.

The same situation of the absence of the sacerdotal concern is observable also in the rabbinic stories of Moses' birth reflected in *b.* Sotah 12a,[64] *Exod. R.* 1:20,[65] *Deut. R.* 11:10,[66] *PRE* 48,[67] and the *Zohar* II.11b,[68] whose authors were possibly cognizant of the Noachic natal account.

Reflecting on this evidence Fletcher-Louis notices that, although the authors of the rabbinic accounts of Moses' birth appear to be familiar with Noah's narrative, these materials do not show any interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the original story. Buried in the ashes of the destroyed Sanctuary, the alternative portrayal of the Noachic priestly

---

[63] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

[64] "He was born circumcised; and the Sages declare, At the time when Moses was born, the whole house was filled with light—as it is written here, 'And she saw him that he was good' (Ex 2:2), and elsewhere it is written, 'And God saw the light that it was good' (Gen 1:4)." *b.* Sotah 12a.

[65] "…she saw that the Shechinah was with him; that is, the 'it' refers to the Shechinah which was with the child." *Midrash Rabbah* (trs. H. Freedman and M. Simon; 10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1961) 3.29–30.

[66] "Moses replied: 'I am the son of Amram, and came out from my mother's womb without prepuce, and had no need to be circumcised; and on the very day on which I was born I found myself able to speak and was able to walk and to converse with my father and mother … when I was three months old I prophesied and declared that I was destined to receive the law from the midst of flames of fire.'" *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.185.

[67] "Rabbi Nathaniel said: the parents of Moses saw the child, for his form was like that of an angel of God. They circumcised him on the eight day and they called his name Jekuthiel." *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (tr. G. Friedländer; 2nd ed.; New York: Hermon, 1965) 378.

[68] "She saw the light of the Shekinah playing around him: for when he was born this light filled the whole house, the word 'good' here having the same reference as in the verse 'and God saw the light that it was good' (Gen 1:4)." *The Zohar* (trs. H. Sperling and M. Simon; 5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 3.35. See also Samaritan *Molad Mosheh*: "She became pregnant with Moses and was great with child, and the light was present." *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life* (tr. J. Bowman; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977), 287.

tradition was neither offensive nor challenging for the heirs of the Pharisaic tradition. Fletcher-Louis observes that, although Moses, like Noah, is able to speak from his birth and the house of his birth becomes flooded with light, "the differences of the specifically priestly form of that older tradition can be clearly seen."[69] He points out that while Moses is able to speak as soon as he is born, he does not bless God, as do Noah and Melchizedek.[70] The same paradigm shift is detected in the light symbolism. While in the rabbinic stories the whole house becomes flooded with light, the Mosaic birth texts do not specifically say that Moses is himself the source of light.[71] These differences indicate that, unlike in *2 Enoch*, where the priestly concerns of the editors come to the fore, in the rabbinic accounts they have completely evaporated.[72] Fletcher-Louis notices that "the fact that in the Mosaic stories the child is circumcised at birth indicates his role as an idealized representative of every Israelite: where Noah bears the marks of the priesthood, Moses carries the principal identity marker of every member of Israel, irrespective of any distinction between laity and priesthood."[73]

The marked absence of sacerdotal concerns in the later imitations of the story may explain why, although the rabbinic authors knew of the priestly affiliations of the hero of the Flood, the story of his priestly birth never appeared in the debates about the priestly successions. This fact convincingly demonstrates that the Noachic priestly tradition reflected in *2 Enoch* can be firmly placed inside the chronological boundaries of the Second Temple period, which allows us to safely assume a date of the Melchizedek story and the entire apocalypse before 70 CE.

---

[69] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

[70] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

[71] Fletcher-Louis reminds that "the illumination of the house through Noah's eyes and the comparison of the light to that of the sun are specifically priestly features of Noah's birth." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52–53.

[72] Although the priestly affiliation of the hero of the Flood was well known to the rabbinic authors, as the story of Shem-Melchizedek has already demonstrated.

[73] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 53.

THE JACOB TRADITION

THE FACE AS THE HEAVENLY COUNTERPART OF THE VISIONARY IN THE SLAVONIC *LADDER OF JACOB*

Introduction

The book of Genesis portrays Jacob as someone who not only saw God but also wrestled with Him. Jacob's visionary experiences begin in Genesis 28 where he sees in a dream the ladder on which the angels of God are ascending and descending. Above the ladder Jacob beholds the Lord. The distinct feature of the Bethel account is the paucity of theophanic imagery. Despite the fact that the vision is linked with the celestial realm ("ladder's top reaching to heaven"), which is labeled in the story as "the awesome place," "the house of God," and "the gate of heaven," the narrative does not offer any descriptions of God's celestial court or his appearance. Instead we have the audible revelation of God, his lengthy address to Jacob with promises and blessings.

God appears again to Jacob in Genesis 32. While the narrative stresses the importance of the vision of God (the account claims that Jacob "saw God face to face" and even called the place of wrestling Peniel/Penuel—"The Face of God"), it focuses its description on Jacob's *wrestling* with God rather than his *seeing* of God.

The reference to the motif of God's Face (which plays an important role in a number of biblical theophanic accounts)[1] and to Jacob's seeing of God "face to face" could however indicate that the authors or editors of Jacob's account might be cognizant of the broader anthropomorphic theophanic debates in which the motif of God's Face[2] played an impor-

[1] See, e.g., Exod. 33:18–23; Ps. 17:15.

[2] On the Face of God, see S. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 49–65; A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century," in C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila and G.S. Lewis (eds.), *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (JSJ, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 325–330; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 2.35–39;

tant role. In order to clarify these theophanic developments, which can shed further light on the background of Jacob's biblical story, the current research must turn to other materials associated with Jacob's traditions where his visionary accounts have a more elaborated form. Such materials include the *Ladder of Jacob*,[3] a Jewish pseudepigraphon, which has survived in its Slavonic translation.

The Slavonic Account of Jacob's Vision

The materials known under the title the *Ladder of Jacob*, have been preserved solely in Slavonic as a part of the so-called *Tolkovaja Paleja*[4] (the Explanatory Palaia) where the editors of its various versions re-

---

M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121; S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993), 105–109; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS, 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970), 236–237; M. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183.

[3] On the *Ladder of Jacob*, see H.F. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 453–463; N. Bonwetsch, "Die Apokryphe 'Leiter Jakobs,'" *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (1900), 76–87; E. Bratke, *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden* (TU 4.3; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899), 101–106; I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896–1910), 1.108–120; A.I. Jacimirskij, *Bibliograficheskij obzor apokrifov v juzhnoslavjanskoj i russkoj pis'mennosti (spiski pamjatnikov)*. I. *Apokrifi vethozavetnye* (Petrograd, 1921), 38–39; M.R. James, "Ladder of Jacob," in *idem, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED, 14; London: SPCK, 1920), 96–103; J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227; G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury* (4 vols.; St. Petersburg, 1865), 3.27–32; *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdelannomu v g. Kolomne v. 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova* (Moscow, 1892), 153–166; I. Ja. Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh licah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki," *Sbornik otd. r. jaz. i slov.* 17.1 (St. Petersburg, 1877), 138–149; M.A. Salmina, "Lestvica Iakova," in D.S. Lihachev (ed.), *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi (XI—pervaja polovina XIV v.)* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), 230–231; D. Svjatskij, *Lestnica Iakova ili son najavu* (St. Petersburg: M. Stasjulevich, 1911), 31–32; N.S. Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrechennoj russkoj literatury* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg, 1863), 1.91–95; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti. vol. 93* (St. Petersburg, 1892), 100a–107b; N.M. Vtoryh, *Drevnosti. Trudy Slavjanskoj komissii Moskovskogo arheologicheskogo obshchestva* 2 (1902), propokol 1.

[4] On *Tolkovaja Paleja*, see V. Adrianova, *K literaturnoi istorii Tolkovoj Palei* (Kiev, 1910); V.M. Istrin, "Redakzii Tolkovoj Palei," *IORJaS* 10/4 (1905), 150–151; *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdelannomu v g. Kolomne v. 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova*; Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh licah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki" 11–12; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892); O.V. Tvorogov, "Paleja Tolkovaja," in Lihachev (ed.),

worked[5] and rearranged them. Despite its long life inside the compendium of heterogeneous materials and its long history of transmission in Greek and Slavonic milieux, the pseudepigraphon seems to have preserved several early traditions that can safely be placed within the Jewish environment of the first century CE. Scholars propose that the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* is most likely derived from its Greek variant, which in turn appears to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic.[6] The content of the work is connected with Jacob's dream about the ladder and the interpretation of the vision. In Horace Lunt's translation, the text is divided into seven chapters.[7] The first chapter depicts Jacob's dream in which he sees the ladder and receives God's audible revelation about the promised land and blessings upon his descendants. In the second chapter, a reader encounters Jacob's lengthy prayer to God in which he uncovers additional details of his dream and asks God to help him interpret the dream. In chapter 3, God sends to Jacob the angel Sariel as an interpreter. In chapter 4, Sariel informs Jacob that his name has been changed to Israel. Perceptive readers may thus notice that despite the title of pseudepigraphon, its text is not only confined to the ladder account but also accommodates features of Jacob's other visions, namely, the substitution of his name during the wrestling account. The last three chapters of the *Ladder* recount Sariel's eschatological interpretations of Jacob's dream in which he reveals to the visionary the details of future human history.

Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi, 285–288; V.M. Uspenskij, *Tolkovaja Paleja* (Kazan', 1876).

[5] Lunt observes that the seventh chapter of the *Ladder* is a later Christian addition juxtaposed to the story by a Slavic (possibly, Russian) editor of *Palaia*; see H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," in *OTP*, 2.401–411 (404–405).

[6] Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," 209.

[7] In this paper I have used H. Lunt's English translation of *Ladder* and follow his division of chapters and verses; see Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 401–411. The Slavonic citations are drawn from the following publications of the manuscripts: Recension A—MS S (Sinodal'naja Palaia. Sin. 210) published in *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda*, 100a–107b; MS R (Rumjancevskaja Palaia. Rum. 455) published in Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury*, 2.27–32; MS F (Krehivskaja Palaia) published in Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi*, 1.108–120; Recension B—MS K (Kolomenskaja Palaia. Tr.-Serg. 38) published in Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrechennoj russkoj literatury*, 1.91–95 and in *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdelannomu v g. Kolomne v. 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova*, 153–166; MS P (Soloveckaja Palaia. Sol. 653) published in Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh licah," 138–149.

The Face as God's Kavod

The imagery of the divine/angelic faces plays a prominent role in the first chapter of *Ladder*. The text describes Jacob's dream in which he sees a twelve step ladder, fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven with the angels ascending and descending on it. This familiar biblical motif then is elaborated further and adds some new features.[8] The story relates that on the ladder Jacob sees twenty-two human faces with their chests, two of them on each step of the ladder. On the top of the ladder, he also beholds another human face "carved out of fire"[9] with its shoulders and arms. In comparison with the previous "faces," this fiery "higher" face looks "exceedingly terrifying." The text portrays God standing above this "highest" face and calling Jacob by his name. The depiction leaves the impression that God's voice[10] is hidden behind this fiery terrifying "face" as a distinct divine manifestation, behind which God conveys to Jacob his audible revelation about the Promised Land and the blessings upon Jacob's descendants.

This description of the celestial "Face" as the fiery anthropomorphic extent,[11] which serves as the embodiment of the deity leads us to another Slavonic text in which the theme of the fiery Face looms large. This text is *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, the hypothetical date of which (c. first century CE) is in close proximity to the date of *Ladder*. *2 Enoch* 22[12] contains a theophanic depiction of the Face of

---

[8] *Ladder of Jacob* 1.3–10 reads: "And behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven. And the top of the ladder was the face as of a man, carved out of fire. There were twelve steps leading to the top of the ladder, and on each step to the top there were two human faces, on the right and on the left, twenty-four faces (or busts) including their chests. And the face in the middle was higher than all that I saw, the one of fire, including the shoulders and arms, exceedingly terrifying, more than those twenty-four faces. And while I was still looking at it, behold, angels of God ascended and descended on it. And God was standing above its highest face, and he called to me from there, saying, 'Jacob, Jacob!' And I said, 'Here I am, Lord!' And he said to me, 'The land on which you are sleeping, to you will I give it, and to your seed after you. And I will multiply your seed…'" Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 407.

[9] Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 406.

[10] James Charlesworth notes that in the *Ladder*, as "in some of other pseudepigrapha, the voice has ceased to be something heard and has become a hypostatic creature." See Charlesworth's comment in Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 406.

[11] I use the term "extent" since the *Ladder* specifically mentions shoulders and arms in its description of the Face.

[12] *2 En.* 22.1–4 (the longer recension): "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not

the Lord, which emits light and fire. The important detail that connects this passage with *Ladder* is that the Face in *2 Enoch* is similarly defined as "fiery"[13] and "terrifying."[14] Another parallel is that in both *2 Enoch* and *Ladder* the Face is understood as the luminous representation of the deity, behind which He can convey His audible revelation to visionaries.[15]

It is noteworthy that the incandescent Face in *2 Enoch*, as well as in *Ladder*, is depicted not as a part of an angelic or divine "body" but rather as the fiery "forefront" of the whole anthropomorphic extent.[16]

It has been previously noted[17] that this fiery extent, labeled in some biblical and intertestamental texts as the "Face," is related to the glorious celestial entity known in theophanic traditions as God's *Kavod*.[18] In these traditions, the Face often serves to designate the radiant *façade* of the divine *Kavod*.[19] This tendency to equate the Face with the *Kavod* can

---

to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 136.

[13] F. Andersen in his commentary on *2 En.* 22 notes the similarities between the fiery face in *2 Enoch* and the face of fire in *Ladder*. Cf. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137, n. 22d.

[14] Both Slavonic pseudepigraphons in their description of the Face share the similar Slavonic terminology, words like face (**лице**); fiery (**огнена**, **изъ огня**); terrifying (**страшно**). Cf. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi*, 1.109; Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury*, 3.27; Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh licah," 138; Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrechennoj russkoj literatury*, 1.91; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda*, 100b; Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, 24 and 38.

[15] See A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 104–105.

[16] It is notable that although the *Ladder* uses the Slavonic term *lice* ("face") in its depiction of the "Face," the text mentions that the face Jacob sees has also shoulders and arms.

[17] A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 2000), 130–147.

[18] The early traces of this tendency to identify *Kavod* with the Face within Enochic tradition can be seen already in the *Book of the Watchers* 14 where the enthroned Glory is labeled the *Face*. Cf. *1 En.* 14:21: "And no angel could enter, and at the appearance of the face (*gaṣṣ*) of him who is honored and praised no (creature of) flesh could look" (M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* [2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978], 2.99.

[19] It is noteworthy, that already in the classic Ezekilean description of God's Glory in Ezek. 1:27, *Kavod* is described similarly to the description of the Face in *Ladder*, namely,

be found already in some biblical accounts, including Exod. 33:18–23, where in response to Moses' plea to God to show him his Glory, God answers that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.[20]

The second chapter of the *Ladder*, in which the visionary asks God to interpret the dream, provides several additional important details about the dream that explicitly identify the fiery Face with God's *Kavod*.

In the second chapter of the Slavonic text, Jacob offers a prayer in which he discloses further details of his vision of the Face. *Ladder* 2:7–19 reads:

> Lord God of Adam your creature and Lord God of Abraham and Isaac my fathers and of all who have walked before you in justice! You who sit firmly on the cherubim and the fiery throne of glory … and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim, carrying the whole world under your arm, yet not being borne by anyone; you who have made the skies firm for the glory of your name, stretching out on two heavenly clouds the heaven which gleams under you, that beneath it you may cause the sun to course and conceal it during the night so that it might not seem a god; (you) who made on them a way for the moon and the stars; and you make the moon wax and wane, and destine the stars to pass on so that they too might not seem gods. Before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings, while flying with their other (wings), and they sing unceasingly a hymn: … whom I now in sanctifying a new (song) … Twelve-topped, twelve-faced, many-named, fiery one! Lightning-eyed holy one! Holy, Holy, Holy, Yao, Yaova, Yaoil, Yao, Kados, Chavod, Savaoth… [21]

Several details are important in this description. Jacob's prayer reveals that his dream about the Face might represent the vision of the Throne of God's Glory. A number of points need to be noted to support this conclusion:

a. The prayer refers to "his many-eyed ones,"[22] alluding to **האופנים**, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who are described in Ezek. 1:18 as the angelic beings "full of eyes."

---

as the fiery *bust*: "I saw that from what appeared to be his *waist up* he looked like glowing metal, as it full of fire, and that from there down he looked like fire; and brilliant light surrounded him."

[20] See Exod. 33:18–23: "Then Moses said, 'Now show me your glory (**כבדך**).' And the Lord said, 'I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence… but,' he said, 'you cannot see my face (**פני**), for no one may see me and live.'"

[21] Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 408.

[22] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 137.

b. The text describes the deity as seated on the fiery Throne of Glory.
c. The vision contains references to the angelic liturgy and the *Trisagion*.
d. The text refers to the fear of the angelic hosts, who stand in the front of the terrifying fiery "Face" and try to protect themselves with their wings ("before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings"). The motif of protection against the harmful brilliance of God's Throne is typical to theophanic descriptions of *Kavod* from the earliest accounts found in Isa. 6:1–4 to the latest accounts found in *3 Enoch*, which relate that "… in ʿArabot there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of ʿArabot would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance."[23]
e. The passage also contains a specific terminology associated with the Throne imagery. It has been mentioned earlier that the Slavonic text of the *Ladder* is possibly based on the Semitic original. *Ladder of Jacob* 2.18 contains a non-Slavonic word *Chavod*[24] which the translator (H. Lunt) defines as the transliterated Hebrew term *Kavod*.[25]
f. Finally, the passage explicitly identifies the fiery Face with God's glory. *Ladder of Jacob* 2:15 says that "before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid… ." Thus the fiery face in *Ladder* 1:6 is not just any face but the Face of God.

The apparent similarities between two Slavonic accounts indicate that *Ladder*, as well as *2 Enoch*, seem to represent a single tradition in which the fiery Face is associated with *Kavod*.

Additional evidence to support the view that the fiery Face on the ladder in *Ladder* represents God's *Kavod* can be found in the targumic accounts of Jacob's story. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Targum Onqelos* give numerous references to the Glory of the Lord in their description of Jacob's vision of the ladder.

---

[23] Alexander, "3 Enoch," in *OTP*, 1.223–315(305).

[24] MS *S—Chavod*; MS *R—Chavod*; MS *F—Chsavod*. See *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda*, 101b; Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury*, 3.28; Franko, *Apokrifi*, 1.110.

[25] See Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 408, n. 2.i.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Gen. 28:13–17 reads:

> And, behold, the Glory of the Lord (יקרא דה) stood beside him and said to him, "I am the Lord, the God of your father Abraham and the God of Isaac. The land on which you are lying I will give to you and to your children" … And Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, "In truth the Glory of the Shekinah (יקר שכינתא) of the Lord dwells in this place, and I did not know it." He was afraid and said, "How awesome and glorious is this place! This is not a profane place, but a sanctuary to the name of the Lord; and this is (a place) suitable for prayer, corresponding to the gate of heaven, founded beneath the Throne of Glory (כורסי יקרא)."[26]

Targum Onqelos[27] to Gen. 28:13–16 also reflects the same tradition, which depicts Jacob's encounter as the vision of the Divine Glory. In both targumic accounts, the Glory of the Lord seems topologically located in the place which in *Ladder* is occupied by the Face.

The Face as Jacob's Heavenly Counterpart

Scholars have previously noted that in *Ladder* the fiery Face not only embodies God's Glory but also seems to represent the heavenly counterpart of Jacob.[28] They observe that the bust of fire, labeled in *Ladder* as the Face, can be associated with the heavenly "image" of Jacob engraved on the Throne of Glory.[29] The traditions about the heavenly

---

[26] *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (trans. M. Maher; AB, 1B; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 99–100; *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia*. IV. *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum* (5 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Matriti: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1977), 1.195–197.

[27] "…and here, The Glory of the Lord (יקרא דיי) was standing over him, and He said, 'I am the Lord, the God of your Father Abraham and the God of Isaac: the land on which you sleep I will give to you and to your offspring …' The Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, 'Truly the Glory of the Lord (יקרא דיי) dwells in this place, and I did not know it'" (*The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* [trans. B. Grossfeld; Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988], 104; M. Aberbach and B. Grossfeld [eds.], *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text* [New York: Ktav, 1982], 171).

[28] J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 135–151(143).

[29] "… [in the *Ladder*] in the fiery bust of the terrifying man we are probably correct to see the heavenly 'image' of Jacob" (Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 143, n. 30).

"image" of Jacob are present in several targumic[30] texts,[31] including *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Targum Neofiti*,[32] and *Fragmentary Targum*.[33]

In *Targ. Ps.-J.* to Gen 28.12 the following description can be found:

> He [Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens … and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the Throne of Glory (**דאיקונין דיליה קביעא בכורסי יקרא**), and whom you have desired to see.[34]

A distinctive feature of this description is that the heavenly counterpart of Jacob, his "image," is engraved on a very special celestial entity, on the *Throne of Glory*. Engraving on the Throne might indicate an association with the *Kavod* since the Throne is the central part of the *Kavod* imagery—the seat of the anthropomorphic Glory of the Lord. The image engraved on the Throne might be an allusion to the face,[35] the fiery face, since it is engraved on the fiery and glorious Throne of the Glory.

---

[30] The same tradition can be found in rabbinic texts. *Gen. R.* 68:12 reads: "…thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa. xlix, 3); it is thou, [said the angels,] whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping." (*Midrash Rabbah* [10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961], 2.626). On Jacob's image on the Throne of Glory, see also *Gen. R.* 78:3; 82:2; *Num. R.* 4:1; b. Hul. 91b; *PRE.* 35.

[31] On the traditions about Jacob's image engraved on the Throne see E.R. Wolfson, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 1–62, 111–186.

[32] "And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: "Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see." And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him" (*Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* [trans. M. McNamara; Aramaic Bible, 1A; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992], 140).

[33] "… And he dreamt that there was a ladder set on the ground, whose top reached towards the heavens; and behold the angels that had accompanied him from his father's house ascended to announce to the angels of the heights: 'Come and see the pious man, whose image is fixed to the throne of glory….'" (M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources* [2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980], 1.57 and 2.20).

[34] *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 99–100; *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia*. IV. *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum*, 1.195.

[35] *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §164) attests to the tradition of Jacob's face engraved on the throne of glory: **לקלסהר פניו יעקב אביהם שהיא חקוקה לי על כסא כבודי**; see P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), 72.

Besides the tradition of "engraving" on the Throne, some Jewish materials point to an even more radical identification of Jacob's image with *Kavod*. Jarl Fossum's research[36] demonstrates that in some traditions about Jacob's image, his "image" or "likeness" is depicted not simply as *engraved* on the heavenly Throne, but as *seated* upon the Throne of Glory.[37] Fossum argues that this second tradition is original. Christopher Rowland proposed that Jacob's image is "identical with the form of God on the throne of glory (Ezek. 1:26f.)."[38] J. Fossum offers additional support for this idea by pointing out that the Hebrew forms of the Greek loan word εἰκών, used in the Targums and *Gen. R.* 68.12, are synonymous with **צלם** and **דמות**.[39] He further suggests that "**איקונין** or **דיוקנא** can thus be seen to denote a bodily form, even that of God, that is the Divine Glory."[40]

The hypothesis about the identification of Jacob's image and the Divine Glory returns us again to the imagery of God's *Kavod* with which, as has been shown earlier, the Face in *Ladder* and *2 Enoch* is closely associated.

Enochic materials may also correlate the Face of God (divine *Kavod*) with the heavenly counterpart of the visionary. In *2 Enoch*, the Face of the Lord seems to play an important role in the description of Enoch's heavenly counterpart. *2 Enoch* 39:3–6 depicts the patriarch who, during his short trip to the earth, retells to his children his earlier encounter with the Face. Enoch relates:

> You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of

---

[36] Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 140–141.

[37] Fossum notes that this tradition is already observable in some versions of the *Fragmentary Targum* which do not contain the verb "engraved" or "fixed" (*The Image of the Invisible God*, 141). He also points to a certain baraita (*b.* Hul. 91b) that seems to attests to the same tradition (139–140).

[38] C. Rowland, "John 1:51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition," *NTS* 30 (1984) 498–507 (504).

[39] Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 142.

[40] Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 142.

> my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end.[41]

Enoch's description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord's Face and body. For this investigation, however, another juxtaposition is most pertinent. It is a contrast between the two identities of the visionary: the earthly Enoch ("a human being created just like yourselves") and his heavenly counterpart ("the one who has seen the Face of God"). It appears that Enoch tries to describe himself in two different modes of existence: as a human being who now stands before his children with a human face and body and as the one who has seen God's Face in the celestial realm. These descriptions of two conditions (earthly and celestial) occur repeatedly in tandem. It is possible that the purpose of Enoch's instruction to his children is not to stress the difference between his human body and the Lord's body, but to emphasize the distinction between *this* Enoch, a human being "created just like yourselves," and the *other* angelic Enoch who has been standing before the Lord's face. Enoch's previous transformation into the glorious one and his initiation into *Sar ha-Panim* in *2 En.* 22.7 support this suggestion. It is unlikely that Enoch somehow completely abandoned his supra-angelic status and his unique place before the Face of the Lord granted to him in the previous chapters. An account of Enoch's permanent installation can be found in chapter 36 where the Lord tells Enoch, before his short visit to the earth, that a place has been prepared for him and that he will be in the front of Lord's face "from *now* and forever."[42] Finally, in chapter 43,[43] Enoch introduces himself to his children as the Governor[44] of the World.[45] This title gives additional proof for the fact that the permanent installation of Enoch-Metatron in the heavenly offices, including the office of the Prince of the World (**שר העולם**), has already taken place. The importance of this account for the idea of

---

[41] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 163.

[42] *2 Enoch* 36:3. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 161.

[43] A similar testimony can also be found in the passage of *2 Enoch* preserved in the Slavonic collection of ethical writings, "The Just Balance" (*Merilo Pravednoe*), in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was first made public. Cf. M.N. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

[44] Andersen translates the title as "the manager of the arrangements on earth," see Andersen, "2 Enoch," 217.

[45] On this title of Enoch and its connection with the office of the Prince of the World, see Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," 82–85.

the heavenly counterpart in *2 Enoch* is apparent because it points to the simultaneous existence of Enoch's angelic double installed in heaven and its human counterpart, whom God sends periodically on missionary errands. Targumic and rabbinic Jacob accounts also attest to this view of the heavenly counterpart when they depict angels beholding Jacob as one who at one and the same time is installed in heaven and is sleeping on earth.[46]

The idea about the heavenly counterpart of the visionary found in *2 Enoch* is also present in another early Enochic account. One of the booklets of *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch* attests a similar tradition. Scholars have previously observed[47] that the *Similitudes* seem to entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of a visionary when it identifies Enoch with the Son of Man.[48] For a long time, students of the Enochic traditions were puzzled by the fact that the Son of Man, who in previous chapters of the *Similitudes* has been distinguished from Enoch, becomes suddenly identified in *1 Enoch* 71 with the patriarch. James VanderKam suggests that this puzzle can be explained by the Jewish notion, attested in several ancient Jewish texts, that a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart.[49] To provide an example, VanderKam points to Jacob's traditions in which the patriarch's "features are engraved on high."[50] He stresses that this theme of the visionary's ignorance of his higher angelic identity is observable, for example, in *Prayer of Joseph.*

---

[46] *Targ. Neof.* to Gen 28:12: "…and behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him [Jacob]" (*Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, 140); *Gen. R.* 68.12: "…they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping" (*Midrash Rabbah*, 2.626).

[47] See J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71," in J.H. Charlesworth *et al.* (eds.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 161–191 (182–183); M.A. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–180; Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 144–145; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), 151.

[48] It is important to note that in the *Similitudes*, the Son of Man is depicted as seated on the Throne of Glory. See *1 En.* 62:5; 69:29. Fossum observes that "in the 'Similitudes' the 'Elect One' or 'Son of Man' who identified as the patriarch Enoch, is enthroned upon the 'throne of glory.' If 'glory' does not qualify the throne but its occupant, Enoch is actually identified with the Glory of God." Fossum further concludes that "…the 'Similitudes of Enoch' present an early parallel to the targumic description of Jacob being seated upon the 'throne of glory'" (*The Image of the Invisible God*), 145.

[49] VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man," 182–183.

[50] VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man," 182–183.

It is noteworthy that in the *Similitudes*, similarly in *2 Enoch* and *Ladder*,[51] the theme of the heavenly counterpart seems to conflate with the imagery of God's *Kavod*. *1 Enoch* 71:5 reports that Enoch is brought by Michael to the fiery structure, surrounded by the rivers of living fire, which he describes as "a something built of crystal stones, and in the middle of those stones tongues of living fire."[52]

There is no doubt that the fiery "structure" in the *Similitudes* represents the Throne of Glory, which, in another booklet of *1 Enoch*, is also described as the crystal structure issuing streams of fire.[53] An explicit reference to the Throne of Glory in *1 En.* 71:8,[54] immediately after the description of the fiery "crystal" structure, makes this clear.

Similarities between *1 Enoch* 71 and *2 Enoch* 22 in the depictions of *Kavod* and Enoch's transformation near the Throne of Glory are also apparent.

a. In both accounts (*1 En.* 71:3–5 and *2 En.* 22:6), Enoch is brought to the Throne by archangel Michael.
b. Angelology of the Throne in *1 Enoch*, as in *2 Enoch* and *Ladder*,[55] includes three classes of angelic beings: ophanim, cherubim and seraphim.
c. Both Enochic accounts speak about the transformation of the visionary. Enoch's metamorphosis in *1 Enoch* 71 recalls the description of the luminous transformation of Enoch into a glorious heavenly being from *2 En.* 22:8–9.
d. In both cases, the transformation takes place in front of the fiery "structure," a possible source of both transformations.

---

[51] A notable detail in the description is that during his ascension Enoch, in a manner similar to Jacob's vision of the ladder, sees the angelic "movements" and the angelic "faces." In *1 En.* 71:1 he reports about "…the sons of the holy angels treading upon flames of fire, and their garments (were) white, and their clothing, and the light of their face (was) like snow" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.165).

[52] Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166.

[53] In the *Book of the Watchers* 14:18–19 the Throne of Glory is also described as a crystal structure surrounded of the rivers of fire. The reference to "crystal" structure also recalls the depiction of the Throne in Ezek. 1.26, where it is described as a throne of sapphire (ספיר).

[54] *1 En.* 71:7: "And round about (were) the Seraphim, and the Cherubim, and the Ophannim; these are they who do not sleep, but keep watch over the throne of his glory" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166).

[55] The *Ladder* also refers to three classes of angels, ophanim (many-eyed ones), cherubim and seraphim, right after the remark about the Throne: "…the fiery Throne of Glory … and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim" (Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob," 408).

e. Studies in the past have noted that in both accounts the transformation of the visionary takes place in the context of the angelic liturgy (*2 En.* 21:1–22.10; *1 En.* 71:11–12).[56] The same feature is also observable in *Ladder* 2.15–18.
f. In both accounts Enoch falls on his face before the Throne.[57]
g. The manner in which Enoch is greeted near the Throne of Glory in *1 En.* 71:14–17 evokes the scene from *2 En.* 22:5–6, where the Lord personally greets Enoch. In both accounts we have an address in which the visionary is informed about his "eternal" status.[58]

These features of both Enochic accounts, entertaining the idea of the heavenly twin, point to the importance of the vision of the *Kavod* in the process of acquiring knowledge about the heavenly counterparts of the visionaries. It is not coincidental that in Jacob's tradition, which also attests the idea of the heavenly counterpart, the vision of God's glory also becomes an important theophanic motif. It is clearly recognizable in the targumic Jacob's accounts and the *Ladder*, where reports about Jacob's angelic counterpart are creatively conflated with theophanic traditions about the vision of God's *Kavod*.

Uriel-Sariel-Phanuel

Another prominent trait that links Jacob's account in the *Ladder* with both above mentioned Enochic accounts (*1 En.* 71 and *2 En.* 22) is the reference to the angel Sariel, also known in various traditions under the names of Phanuel and Uriel.[59]

---

[56] Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 154.

[57] *1 En.* 71:11: "And I fell upon my face" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166); *2 En.* 21:2: "I fell on my face" (Andersen, "2 [Slavonic Apocalypse of] Enoch," 135).

[58] *1 En.* 71:14–15: "You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness remains over you…and so you will have it for ever and for ever and ever" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166–167); *2 En.* 22:5–6: "Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face *forever*" (Andersen, "2 Enoch," 138–139).

[59] J. Smith observes that in five instances in *1 Enoch* (40:9; 54:6; 71:8, 9, 13), confined to the *Similitudes*, Phanuel replaces Uriel in a catalog of the four archangels. He also points out that while Sariel is a relatively unknown angelic figure, his name seems to be quite frequently conflated with Uriel, as in *1 En.* 9:1. Cf. J.Z. Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," in *OTP*, 2.699–714 (708–709). For the discussion about Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel, see J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, xxxiv–xxxv; Lunt, "*The Ladder*

In *2 Enoch* 22–23, Uriel[60] plays an important role during Enoch's initiations near the Throne of Glory.[61] He instructs Enoch about various subjects of esoteric knowledge in order to prepare him for various celestial offices, including the office of the Heavenly Scribe.

1 Enoch 71 also refers to the same angel and names him Phanuel. In the *Similitudes*, he occupies an important place among the four principal angels, namely, the place usually assigned to Uriel. In fact, the angelic name "Phanuel" might be a title which stresses the celestial status of Uriel/Sariel[62] as one of the servants of the divine *Panim*.[63]

The title "Phanuel" is reminiscent of the terminology found in various Jacob's accounts. In Gen. 32:31, Jacob names the place (**המקום**) of his wrestling with God as Peniel (**פניאל**)—the Face of God.[64] Scholars believe that the angelic name *Phanuel* and the place *Peniel* are etymologically connected.[65]

---

of Jacob," 405, n. 10; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*: *Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 170–174; Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*: 105–109; J.Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph," in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 270 and 227; G. Vermes, "The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA, 12.3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 159–166; *idem*, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies During the Last Twenty-Five Years," *JJS* 26 (1975) 1–14 (13).

[60] Slav. **Вѣреевеилъ** (*Vereveil*).

[61] The beginning of this tradition can be found in the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 En.* 74:2), where Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. See Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.173.

[62] Vermes observes that at Qumran, "Sariel becomes one of the four chief angels, replacing Uriel, the traditional fourth archangel in the Greek Enoch and midrashic literature … He also appears in an Aramaic fragment of 4Q Enoch 9.1" (Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," 13).

[63] *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §108) refers to the angel Suria/Suriel as the Prince of the Face: **סוריא/סוריאל שר הפנים**. Cf. Schäfer, with Schlüter and von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, 52. On the identification of Sariel with the Prince of the Presence, see Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 99–100; Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," 709.

[64] The connection between the terms God's Face (**פניאל**) and the Place (**המקום**) in Gen. 32:31 is important. In later theophanic contexts the term **המקום** is closely associated with the *Kavod* imagery. This tradition can be found, for example, in *3 En.* 45:1; 47:1; 48D:8. *3 Enoch* also uses an expression "the Curtain (*pargod*) of the Place" in reference to the celestial veil, which shields the angelic hosts from the harmful luminescence of the *Kavod*.

[65] G. Vermes suggests that the angelic name Phanuel "is depended on the Peniel/Penuel of Genesis 32." Cf. Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," 13. Smith supports Vermes' position. In his opinion, "it is most likely that the name Phanuel is to be derived from the place name Peniel/Penuel (the face of God) in Genesis 32:30, and therefore may be related to the title 'a man seeing God'" (Smith,

Although the *Ladder*'s narrative does not directly refer to the angel named Phanuel, it uses another of his names, Sariel, in reference to the angelic being, who interprets Jacob's dream and announces to him his new angelic status, depicted symbolically in the changing of the patriarch's name to Israel. The *Ladder of Jacob* 2 portrays Jacob asking God in prayer for help in interpreting the dream. Chapter 3 of the *Ladder* relates that God responds to Jacob's prayer by commanding: "Sariel, leader of those who comfort, you who in charge of dreams, go and make Jacob understand the meaning of the dream." The text further depicts the angelophany of Sariel who comes to the patriarch to inform him about his new angelic name and status.

This reference to Sariel/Uriel as the angel who instructs/wrestles with Jacob and announces to him his new angelic name is documented in several other sources, including *Targum Neofiti* and *Prayer of Joseph*. In *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob attests that "Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that 'I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob'. He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me…"[66]

In targumic and rabbinic accounts, Sariel/Uriel is also depicted as the angel who wrestled with Jacob and announced him his new angelic name.

Targum Neofiti to Gen. 32.25–31 reads:

> And Jacob was left alone; and the angel Sariel (**שריאל**) wrestled with him in the appearance of a man and he embraced him until the time the dawn arose. When he saw that he could not prevail against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh and the hollow of Jacob's thigh became benumbed in his wrestling with him. And he said: "Let me go because the rise of the dawn has arrived, and because the time of the angels on high to praise has arrived, and I am a chief of those who praise" (**ואנא ריש למשבחיא**). And he said: "I will not let you go unless you bless me." And he said to him: "What is your name?" And he said: "Jacob." And he said: "Your name shall no longer be called Jacob but Israel, because you have claimed superiority with angels from before the Lord and with men and you have prevailed against them. And Jacob asked and said: "Tell me your name I pray"; and he said: "Why, now, do you ask my name?" And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel

"Prayer of Joseph," 709). See also S. Olyan, who argues that "the angel Penuel was either derived from texts such Exod. 13:14–15 and Deut. 4:37, where the divine presence is given figurative treatment, or it emerged from the exegesis of Gen. 32:25–33" (Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 108–109).

[66] Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," 713.

(**פניאל**) because: "I have seen angels from before the Lord face to face and my life has been spared."[67]

Scholars have previously noted that "in the circles represented by the Similitudes of Enoch, Qumran and Neofiti variety of the Palestinian Targum, the angelic adversary of Jacob was recognized as one of the four celestial princes and called alternatively Sariel or Phanuel."[68] It appears that *Ladder* also belongs to the same circles. In *Targ. Neof.* and *Frag. Targ.*[69] to Gen 32:27, Sariel is defined as "the chief of those who give praise" (**ריש למשבחיא**). The *Ladder* seems to allude to this title. In the *Ladder* 3:2 Sariel is described as "*stareishino uslazhdaemych*"[70] which can be translated as "the chief of those who give joy."[71]

It is of interest to note that in the *Ladder*, Sariel/Phanuel imagery seems to be influenced by the Enochic tradition even more extensively than in the Targums; in the *Ladder*, the motif of wrestling is completely absent and is replaced by the depiction of Sariel as the interpreter of dreams. It seems that Sariel/Uriel in the *Ladder* assumes the traditional "Enochic" functions of *angelus interpres*.[72]

Princes of the Face

In the *Ladder* and the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob's identification with his heavenly counterpart, the angel Israel, involves the initiatory encounter with the angel Sariel/Uriel, who in other texts is also known as Phanuel, the angel of the Divine Presence or the Face. The same state of events is observable in Enochic materials where Uriel serves as

---

[67] *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*, 158; A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1, Targum Palistinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (6 vols.; Textos y Estudios, 7; Madrid/Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968), 1.217–219.

[68] Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," 13; Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," 709.

[69] Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch*, 1.59 and 2.22.

[70] Slav. **ѕтарѣишино оуслаждаемъıхъ.** MSS *S, R, F.* Cf. *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda*, 101b; Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury*, 3.28; Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi*, 1.110.

[71] Slavonic **оуслаждаемъıхъ** (*uslazhdaemych*) can be literally translated as "sweetened." Cf. R.M. Cejtlin (ed.), *Staroslovjanskij slovar' po rukopisjam X–XI vekov* (Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994), 477; I.I. Sresnevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989), 3.1266.

[72] On Uriel as an *angelus interpres*, see C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGJU, 42; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 60.

a principal heavenly guide to another prominent visionary who has also acquired knowledge about his own heavenly counterpart, namely, Enoch/Metatron. In both traditions, Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel appears as the guide who assists the visionaries in acquiring or identifying with their new celestial identities.

The process of establishing twinship with the heavenly counterpart might be reflected in the initiatory procedure of becoming a *Sar ha-Panim*, one of the angelic[73] Princes of the Divine Face or Presence, the prominent celestial office, which is often described in detail in various apocalyptic and Merkabah accounts. The installation of a visionary as *Sar ha-Panim* seems to correlate with the procedure of identifying a visionary with his heavenly counterpart.[74] In *1 Enoch* 71, Enoch is transformed and identified with the Son of Man in front of God's Throne. In *2 En.* 22:6–10, Enoch's initiation into one of the Princes of Presence[75] also takes place in front of the fiery Face of the Lord. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious being. It is important to note that after this procedure Enoch observes that he had *become like one of the glorious ones*, and *there was no observable difference*.[76] The last phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new identity as "one of the glorious ones." This identity might refer to his angelic counterpart. It also indicates that Enoch's earthly appearance/face has been radically altered and that the visionary has now acquired a new "face" which "mirrors" or "doubles" the Face of the Lord.[77] The motif of engraving the image of the visionary on the Throne might also serve as a metaphor for

---

[73] For a complete discussion about angels as the heavenly counterparts of humans, see De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 148–157.

[74] The reference to the angels of the Presence as the heavenly counterparts of humans is not confined solely to the Jewish pseudepigrapha. April De Conick's research refers to several important Christian passages in which angels of the Presence/the Face serve as heavenly counterparts of humans; see De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 153–154. One of such traditions is reflected in Mt.18:10: "See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you that in heaven their angels always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven."

[75] On Enoch's role as the Prince of the Presence in *2 Enoch*, see Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," 74–75.

[76] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 139.

[77] A visionary, therefore, becomes a reflection or even a "representation" of the Face/*Kavod*, a sort of its vice-regent. Christopher Morray-Jones observes that "there is evidence, then, of the early existence of a tradition concerning the ascent to heaven of an exceptionally righteous man who beholds the vision of the divine *Kabod* upon Merkabah, is transformed into an angelic being and enthroned as celestial vice-regent, thereby becoming identified with the Name-bearing angel who either is or is closely associated with the *Kabod* itself and functions as a second, intermediary power in

the similarity between the visionary's face and the Face. There is no doubt that one of the features which unifies both "faces" is their luminosity.

2 Enoch's narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frigid," then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face into the *Sar ha-Panim* involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles *Kavod*. We can find a detailed description of this process in another "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch/Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into the fiery creature:

> R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire.[78]

It is possible that the reference to the heavenly counterpart of Jacob in the form of his image (engraved) on the Throne of Glory also implies that Jacob is one of the servants of the Divine Face. This possibility is already hinted at in the biblical account where Jacob is attested as one who saw God face to face.[79] Moreover, in some of Jacob's traditions, he is directly described (in a manner similar to Enoch/Metatron) as the Prince of the Divine Face. We learn about this title from the *Prayer of Joseph* 8,[80] where Jacob-Israel himself unveils his

---

heaven" (C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 [1992] 10–11).

[78] *3 En.* 15:1. Alexander, "3 Enoch," 267.

[79] Gen. 32:30 "…it is because I saw God face to face (**פנים אל פנים**)."

[80] The tradition about Jacob as the *Prince* of Presence seems to be also reflected in *Targ. Onq.* to Gen. 32:29: "Whereupon, he said, 'No longer shall your name be called Jacob, but rather Israel; for your are a *prince* before the Lord and among men; therefore have you prevailed'" (*The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, 116).

status as the *Sar*[81] *ha-Panim*,[82] proclaiming that he is "the first minister before the Face of God."

It is also not coincidental that the initiation of Jacob into an angelic being involves another servant of the Face, the angel Sariel whose last name, Phanuel,[83] reflects his close proximity to the Face of God. As has been mentioned previously, this initiatory pattern is already observable in the Enochic tradition, where Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel (along with another angel of the Presence, Michael)[84] actively participates in the initiation of the another prominent servant of the Divine Face, Enoch/Metatron.

However, Jacob's identification with a *Sar ha-Panim* seems to be missing one detail that constitutes a distinct feature of the descriptions of visionaries initiated in this office, that is the luminous metamorphosis of an adept's face and body. The *Ladder of Jacob* and *Prayer of Joseph*, as well as the biblical account of Jacob's vision, are silent about any transformation of Jacob's body and his face. This tradition, however, can be found in another prominent account connected with the Jacob story.[85] In this important material, the eyes of Jacob, similar to the eyes of the transformed Metatron, are emitting flashes of lighting.

---

[81] Vermes notices that *Targum Neofiti* explains the etymology of Israel from שרר ("to rule, to act as a prince"); see Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," 13.

[82] Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 141–142.

[83] The fact that Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel is known under several names might indicate that this angel also serves as a heavenly counterpart in the manner similar to other servants of the Face such as Jacob/Israel, Enoch/Metatron, and possibly Melchizedek/Michael. On the identification of Michael with Melchizedek, see J.R. Davila, "Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven," in *SBLSP* 35 (1996), 259–272; D.D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2/109; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999), 70–74.

[84] Olyan refers to Rashi's passage which identifies "the 'angel of his presence' of Isa. 63:9 with Michael, the Prince of Presence" (Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 108).

[85] The beginning of the second half of *Joseph and Aseneth* gives a description of Joseph and Aseneth visiting Jacob. *Jos. and Asen.* 22:7–8 says that when Aseneth saw Jacob, she "was amazed at his beauty… his eyes (were) flashing and darting (flashes of) lighting, and his sinews and his shoulders and his arms were like (those) of an angel, and his thighs and his calves and his feet like (those) of a giant. And Jacob was like a man who had wrestled with God. And Aseneth saw him and was amazed, and prostrated herself before him face down to the ground" (C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *OTP*, 2.177–247 [238]).

Conclusion

Finally, it is necessary to address the question why some theophanic traditions depict angelic beings as both the servants of the Face and the Face itself. Later Merkabah accounts categorize Metatron as the Face of God.[86] The reference to Uriel/Sariel, who is also known as Phanuel ("the Face of God"), can serve as another example. This ambiguity in the theophanic tradition is also apparent in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*, where the fiery Face can be taken as either God's *Kavod* or an enthroned vice-regent associated with the Face (i.e. the enthroned Jacob-Israel). The difficulty in discerning between these two luminous entities can be illustrated through a reference to a late "Enochic" passage (*3 En.*), describing the enthronement of Metatron at the door of the seventh palace. From this account we learn that when one infamous visionary encountered the enthroned Metatron, he took it as something equal to the Chariot. Then, according to the story, the visionary opened his mouth and uttered: "There are indeed two powers[87] in heaven!"[88]

Besides other things, this account might serve as:

1. an additional evidence that some heavenly counterparts are indeed "mirrors" of the Face;
2. an important lesson about the evasive nature of the celestial "faces"; and
3. a warning about the possible perils for those who try to explain what these "faces" might really represent.

[86] For the identification of Metatron with the Face, see De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship," 329; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988), 424–425. Morray-Jones notes that in the Merkabah texts Metatron "in some sense embodies, the *Kabod*." Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," 9.

[87] On "two powers in heaven," see Alan Segal's pioneering research in his *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

[88] Alexander, "3 Enoch," 268.

THE MELCHIZEDEK TRADITION

MELCHIZEDEK LEGEND OF *2 (SLAVONIC) ENOCH*

Contemporary scholarship does not furnish a consensus concerning the possible provenance of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*.[1] In the context of the ambigu-

[1] On different approaches to *2 Enoch* see: I.D. Amusin, *Kumranskaja Obshchina* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983); F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.91–221; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); *idem*, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992); *idem*, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ, 5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); *idem*, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt, 59; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); R.H. Charles, and W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); J.H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Collins, "The Genre of Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Gry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A.S.D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316; N. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963) 130–147; *idem*, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72–78; J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973); A. Orlov, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch*," *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26; *idem*, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *Types of Redemption* (eds. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87; A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (4 vols.; ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Christiandad, 1984), 4.147–202; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prig-

ity and uncertainty about the cultural and theological origins of *2 Enoch*, even distant voices of certain theological themes in the text become very important. One of these important theological reminiscences of *2 Enoch* is the theme of Melchizedek—the legendary priest of God Most High.[2]

---

otovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih (COIDR)* 4 (1910), 1–167; M. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (2 vols; CRINT, 2.2; Assen Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2, 406–408; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995).

[2] On Melchizedek traditions and Melchizedek in *2 Enoch* see: I. Amusin, "Novyj eshatologicheskij tekst iz Kumrana (11QMelchizedek)," *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 3 (1967) 45–62; *idem*, *Teksty Kumrana* (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka, 33/1; Moscow: Nauka, 1971); V. Aptowitzer, "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93–113; A. Caquot, "La pérennité du sacerdoce," *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1978), 109–116; M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965–1966) 301–326; M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 115–135; F. du Toit Laubscher, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11 Q Melh 13b," *JSJ* 3 (1972) 46–51; J. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBLSBS, 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974), 245–267; J. Gammie, "Loci of the Melchizedek Tradition of Gen. 14:18–20," *JBL* 90 (1971) 385–396; F. García Martínez, "4Q Amram B 1:14; ¿Melkiresa o Melkisedeq?" *RevQ* 12 (1985) 111–114; C. Gianotto, *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche* (sec II a.C.-sec. III d.C) (SrivB, 12; Brescia: Paideia, 1984); I. Gruenwald, "The Messianic Image of Melchizedek," *Mahanayim* 124 (1970) 88–98 (in Hebrew); F. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS, 30; Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University, 1976); P. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša^c* (CBQMS, 10; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); O. Michel, "Melchizedek," *TDNT* 4.568–571; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in the First Tractate of the Unpublished Coptic-Gnostic Codex IX from Nag Hammadi," *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion* (Supplements to Numen, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 200–208; *idem*, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); J. Petuchowski, "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," *HUCA* 28 (1957) 127–136; H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps. 110)," *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1950), 461–472; M. Simon, "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* (1937) 58–93; R. Smith, "Abram and Melchizedek (Gen. 14, 18–20)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* LXXXVII (1965), 129–153; H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchizedekianer mit Untersuchungen ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, 8/2; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1928); G. Vajda, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *Journal Asiatique* 234 (1943–1945) 173–183; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (BZNW, 5; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1927).

Before giving an exposition of the content of the story it is worth mentioning that for a long time the legend was considered to be an interpolation in the text of *2 Enoch*. Charles, Morfill, and Bonwetsch[3] thought that the theme of Melchizedek was a sort of appendix and did not belong to the main body of the text. For this reason, the legend was not investigated for a long time. Even Fred Horton in his fundamental work dedicated to the Melchizedek tradition ignores the material of *2 Enoch* on the basis that it is found only in one recension.[4] On the contrary to these opinions, A. Vaillant successfully demonstrates that Melchizedek's legend is an integral part of *2 Enoch*. F. Andersen supports this position. His new collation of manuscripts shows that the Melchizedek tradition is found in both recensions, in six manuscripts which represent four text families. His final conclusion is that "there is no evidence that the second part ever existed separately."[5]

Exposition

The Melchizedek narrative occupies the last chapters of the book. The content of the story is connected with the family of Nir,[6] the priest,

---

[3] Cf. R.H. Charles and W.R. Morfill., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); G.N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin, 1896).

[4] Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 81.

[5] Andersen, 92.

[6] Slav. **Нир**. There were a number of attempts to interpret this enigmatic name. One of them was Vaillant's hypothesis that Slavonic "Nir" equals Semitic **נר**, and can be taken in its etymological sense as "light." He supports his opinion by referring to Ethiopic Enoch, since Nir, the brother of Noah, is in *2 Enoch* a "dedoublement" of Noah, who was described as the wonder child in *1 Enoch* 106. Vaillant, xii. Vaillant's argument probably refers to the "light-like appearence" of Noah in Ethiopic Enoch: "His eyes are like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious" (106:5). The hypothesis has many weak points. Rubinstein shows the difficulty of this explanation, because the "dedoublement" of Noah in *Slavonic Enoch* is related to the description of Melchizedek, not Nir (see our discussion about Noah-Melchizedek's birth). Rubinstein also stresses that there is nothing miraculous about Nir in *2 Enoch* and he (Nir) can be described as a "sacerdotal drudge." Rubinstein, *Observations*, 17–18. Rubinstein notes a remote possibility that the name of Nir was chosen with an eye to the figurative use of the term **נר** in the Old Testament for the description of "dominion" of David's descendants. He further suggests that "it is not impossible that an oral exegesis of the Melchizedek legend in *Slavonic Enoch* somehow connected Melchizedek and Nir with Davidic descent, though the fact that Nir is only said to have adopted Melchizedek is an obvious difficulty." Rubinstein, *Observations*, 18. Finally, J. Milik argues that Nir "certainly means 'luminary,' because the author of *2 Enoch* doubtless drew on the name of the wife of

who is pictured in the book as "second son of Lamech"[7] and the brother of Noah. Sothonim[8] the wife of Nir, gave birth to a child "in her old age,"[9] right "on the day of her death."[10] She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband."[11] The book narrates that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy.[12] Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from

---

Noah, Νωρία, meaning 'Fire of God.'" Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 115. In my opinion, one more possible explanation of the name Nir can be suggested. This interpretation can be connected with the meaning of Nir as "clearing, breaking ground or earth." M. Jastrow in his dictionary defines **ניר** as "to break ground," "to clear." Cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1985), 909. According to Jastrow it can mean "new broken land' in some instances. In *2 Enoch* the destiny of Nir is connected with "clearing of the Earth." The Lord told him that He planned "to send down a great destruction on the earth." Nir is the last priest before the great destruction of the Flood. At the very end of *2 Enoch*, Nir says: "For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion, and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation." Nir is indeed the man who beheld the future "clearing, breaking down" of the earth, therefore it is possible that his name reflects this coming situation.

[7] Slav. **Нира сына Ламехова втораго**.

[8] Slav. **Софонимь, Софонима**. Rubinstein tries to connect this proper name with the facts of Sothonim's biography. He draws attention to the details of the story: Sothonim who had been described earlier as old and on the point of death, falls dead at Nir's feet and while Nir is away, having gone to inform Noah of Sothonim's death, the infant Melchizedek emerges from her body. Rubinstein believes that it is highly probable that the author of *2 Enoch* had in mind the story of Benjamin's birth in Gen 35:18. Rachel travailed, and had a difficult labor and as her soul was departing … she called his name Ben-oni…, i.e. the son of my sorrow. Rubinstein further suggests that the name Sothonim may well mean "the end of afflictions," "the end of sorrows"—in Hebrew, **סוף אונים**—symbolic of Sothonim's release from the feelings of shame and sorrow during her pregnancy and her dispute with Nir. Cf. Rubinstein, *Observations*, 18.

[9] Slav. **во врема старости**.

[10] Slav. **в день смерти**.

[11] Certain parallels with the birth of Jesus were discussed by scholars. Andersen concludes that "it is certainly not an imitation of the account of Jesus' birth found in Matthew and Luke… No Christian could have developed such a blasphemy." Andersen, 97.

[12] Professor Ben Zion Wacholder in his kind letter to me suggested an interesting interpretation of the name Sothonim. He mentioned that the phonetic pattern of the name could be traced to the Hebrew word **צפונים**, hidden or mysteries. The hypothesis is supported by the fact that Sothonim hid herself from Nir during days of her pregnancy.

him, but she died at his feet. Melchizedek[13] was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord.

It is of great significance that the newborn child was marked by the sign of priesthood. The story describes how "the badge of priesthood"[14] was on his chest, and it was glorious in appearance. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and they fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel[15] to take the child and place him[16] in "the paradise Eden" so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. Final passages of the short recension describe the ascent of Melchizedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

Shem Traditions

The Melchizedek narrative in the book is connected with the name of Noah, the legendary pre-deluge patriarch. We can not only find Noah in the book but also his grandfather, Methuselah[17] and his father, Lamech. The midrashim of these descendants of Enoch occupy chapters 68–73 of the text. Right after Enoch's ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, "the sons of Enoch," constructed an altar at Achuzan,[18] the place where Enoch had been taken up (ch. 68). It is important to stress that the term *Achuzan* here is a specific name for the hill of the Temple in Jerusalem. In chapter 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him as the priest before the people. Verses 11–16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. Chapter 70 reveals the last days of Methuselah on the earth before his death.

---

[13] Slav. **Мелхиседек**.

[14] Slav. **Печать свѧтительства**.

[15] In the longer recension—Michael.

[16] The preservation of Melchizedek as protection against the unrighteousness of the world reveals an interesting parallel to the Qumranic term **פרדס קושטא**—"paradise of righteousness."

[17] Slav. **Мефѳсаломь, Мефоусаль**.

[18] Slav. **Ахоузань**.

The Lord again appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of his son Lamech—Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass on the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah—Lamech's firstborn son. The text just mentions that the people answered on that request, "Let it be so for us, and let the word of the Lord be just as he said to you." Further the book narrates that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood in front of the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of altar."[19]

As shown, *2 Enoch* presents Melchizedek as a continuation of the priestly line from Methuselah, son of Enoch, directly to the second son of Lamech, Nir (brother of Noah), and on to Melchizedek. *2 Enoch* therefore considers Melchizedek as the grandson of Lamech. This understanding of Melchizedek as the continuation of the priestly line of descendants of Enoch has interesting parallels in rabbinic literature.

In the Babylonian Talmud the following passage is found:

> R. Zechariah said on R. Ishmael's authority: The Holy One, blessed be He, intended to bring forth the priesthood from Shem, as it is written, 'And he [Melchizedek] was the priest of the most high God' (Gen 14:18). But because he gave precedence in his blessing to Abraham over God, He brought it forth from Abraham; as it is written, 'And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, and blessed be the most high God' (Gen 14:19). Said Abraham to him, 'Is the blessing of a servant to be given precedence over that of his master?' Straightway it [the priesthood] was given to Abraham, as it is written (Ps. 110:1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;' which is followed by, 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek' (Ps. 110:4), meaning, 'because of the word of Melchizedek.' Hence it is written, And he was a priest of the most High God, [implying that] he was a priest, but not his seed (*b*. Ned. 32b).[20]

This identification of Melchizedek with Shem, son of Noah, descendant of Methuselah and Lamech by Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha was very popular in rabbinic literature.[21] We can find the origins of the tra-

---

[19] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 197–203.

[20] *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nedarim* (London: Soncino Press, 1936), 98–99.

[21] Two other rabbinic evidences that attest Melchizedek as Shem include *Pirke R. El.* and *Gen. Rab*. *Pirke R. El.* has two references to Melchizedek-Shem. The first reference occurs in the passage dedicated to the handling of the tradition of intercalation among the Patriarchs. The text says that "Noah handled on the tradition to Shem, and he

dition from a very early time; identifying Melchizedek as Shem can be found in the Targums,[22] Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 14:18 shows the exegetical development of this identification: "And Melchisedech, king of Jerusalem—he is Shem the Great—brought out bread and wine, for he was the priest who ministered in the high priesthood before the most High God."[23] The *Tg. Ps.-J.* holds a similar exegetical position when it reads: "… the righteous king—that is Shem, the son of Noah—king of Jerusalem, went out to meet Abram, and brought him bread and wine; at that time he was ministering before God Most High."[24] Biblical chronology proves the possibility of the meeting of Shem (Melchizedek) and Abraham after the defeat of the kings (Gen 14:17). According to Gen 11:10–26, Shem lived 500 years after the birth of his first son Arphaxad. There were 290 years between the birth of Arphaxad and the birth of Abram. When Abram

---

was initiated in the principle of intercalation; he intercalated the years and he was called a priest, as it is said, "And Melchizedek king of Salem … was a priest of God Most High" (Gen 14:18). Was Shem the Son of Noah a priest? But because he was the first-born, and because he ministered to his God by day and by night, therefore was he called a priest." *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. Translated by Gerald Friedländer (New York: Hermon, 1965), 53. The second reference to Melchizedek-Shem in *Pirke R. El.* occurs in the chapter 28 where we can find the following passage: "Rabbi Joshua said: Abraham was the first to begin to give a tithe. He took all the tithe of the kings and all the tithe of the wealth of Lot, the son of his brother, and gave (it) to Shem, the Son of Noah, as it is said, 'And he gave him a tenth of all.'" *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. Translated by Gerald Friedländer (New York: Hermon, 1965), 195.

Gen. Rab. gives a very interesting interpretation to the fear of Abram after his meeting with Melchizedek. It says: "Fear not, Abram. Whom did he fear? Rabbi Berekiah said: He feared Shem (whose descendants, viz. Chedorlaomer and his sons, Abraham had slain), as it is written, 'The isles saw, and feared' (Isa 41:5): just as islands stand out in the sea, so were Abraham and Shem outstanding in the world. And feared: Each one feared the other. The former (Abraham) feared the latter, thinking, perhaps he nurses resentment against me for slaying his sons. And the latter (Shem) feared the former, thinking, Perhaps he nurses resentment against me for begetting wicked offspring." *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961), 1.365. This passage shows that not only was Melchizedek Shem, but the four kings of the Elamite opposition were sons of Shem.

[22] Only the *Tg. Onq*. does not mention Shem in connection with Melchizedek. The interesting fact here is that *Tg. Onq*. is the only targum which also shows a negative attitude toward Enoch: "and Enoch walked in reverence of the Lord, then he was no more, for the Lord has caused him to die (Gen. 5,24)." B. Grossfeld (tr.), *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988), 52.

[23] M. McNamara (tr.), *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (AB, 1A; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992), 92.

[24] M. Maher (tr.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (AB, 1B; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992), 58.

was born, Shem lived for another 210 years. According to Gen 25:7 Abraham lived 175 years. Therefore Shem in fact outlived Abraham by 35 years.

Another important point in identification of Shem and Melchizedek is the fact that the blessing of Shem in Gen 9:26 has distinct parallels with the blessing which Melchizedek gives to Abraham. Fred Horton proves that both blessings have some similarities from "a form-critical standpoint."[25]

It is interesting to note several important similarities between targumic and rabbinic material and Melchizedek's portion of *2 Enoch.*

a. *2 Enoch* as well as targumic and rabbinic sources tried to put the genealogy of Melchizedek into the Semitic context of Enoch's descendants. They endeavored to give this abstract and ahistorical character of Genesis a certain historical location and place him in the context of the pre-Deluge generation.

b. Both traditions are interested in the descriptions of the priestly functions of Enoch's family.[26] *2 Enoch* has a lengthy account of Methuselah and Nir with elaborate descriptions of their priestly and sacrificial duties and practices. As Rubinstein notes, "it is hard to escape the impression that the purpose of the account is to build up the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek."[27] The main point of the passage from *b.* Ned. as well as from *Gen. Rab.* and *Pirke R. El.* is the building up of the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek (Shem) in the context of the transmission of this priestly line to Abraham.

c. Both traditions are also interested in taking away the priestly line from Enoch's historical descendants. *b.* Ned. 32b stressed about Shem-Melchizedek, "he was priest; but not his seed." Melchizedek's final translation to heaven at the end of *2 Enoch* also shows discontinuation of the historical priestly line of Enoch's relatives. In the text, the Lord says: "Melchizedek will be my priest to all priests,[28] and I will sanctify

[25] Horton, 117.

[26] Sacchi notes that the Melchizedek story in *2 Enoch* gives "the impression of a work that develops an Enochic priestly tradition in the midst of the problems of first-century Jewish thought, with particular reference to the relation between the function of Enoch and those of Melchizedek." Cf. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 234–235.

[27] Rubinstein, 5.

[28] Andersen notices that this detail is one more piece of evidence against Christian

him and I will change him into a great people who will sanctify me… Melchizedek will be the head of the priests in another generation."[29]

d. Another important point, which can be found in observations of the rabbinic and *2 Enoch* sources, is that the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* attempts to build an alternative to the traditional rabbinic line from Methuselah's priestly vocation, which can be some type of parallel to the official Noah-Shem line. The important theological role in this shift is played by previously unknown Nir, the young brother of Noah.[30]

We can see some sort of theological polemic by the author of *2 Enoch* with traditional Jewish (targumic, rabbinic) positions. It shows that the traditional Jewish settings of the Oral Torah about Melchizedek as Shem were very important and authoritative for the audience of *2 Enoch* even in the situation of their rejection.

Noachic Traditions

Our previous analysis of Shem traditions in the Melchizedek story reveals also some references to the Noachic tradition.[31] A substitution of the line Noah-Shem for the line Nir-Melchizedek shows that one of the main targets of the author's polemic in *2 Enoch* is in fact a Noah figure. It is not a coincidence that this sort of polemic takes place in the Enochic narrative. From the earliest Enochic materials we can see the interdependence of Noachic and Enochic traditions. Kvanvig shows that in Noachic traditions Noah and Enoch often appear in the

---

authorship of *2 Enoch*. He says that "the fantastic details about this priest conflict with Christian belief in Jesus as God's sole legitimate priest in heaven." Andersen, 96.

[29] Andersen, 209.

[30] This substitution of Nir for Noah could be also viewed as a polemic with Noachic tradition. See our analysis of Noachic tradition.

[31] On Noachic traditions see: L. Bailey, *Noah: the Person and the Story in History and Tradition* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1989); F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 24–44; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–23; *idem*, The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992), 213–231.

same roles.[32] The *Slavonic Enoch* in many ways is a continuation of this tendency.

According to some scholars, Melchizedek's story in *Slavonic Enoch* recalls some parallels with the birth of Noah[33] in the *Genesis Apocryphon* of Qumran.[34] In the Qumran text, Lamech is worried about the birth of Noah, his son. Lamech suspects that his wife Bathenosh was unfaithful to him and that "the conception was (the work) of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephil[in]."[35] The story of the relationship between Lamech and Bathenosh found in the *Apocryphon* is very similar to the story of the relationships between Nir and Sothonim. However, there are some essential differences between the texts. In the Qumran text the wife of Lamech, in response to his angry questions, tries to remind him of their intimacies—"Oh my brother and lord! remember my sexual pleasure … […] in the heat of intercourse, and the gasping of my breath in my breast."[36] She swears that the seed was indeed of Lamech: "I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of the hea[vens…]…[…] that this seed comes from you, […] and not from any foreigner nor from any of the watchers or sons of heav[en]."[37]

---

[32] H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 117.

[33] Another similar motif in the Noachic traditions is the story of Noah's birth in *1 Enoch* 106, who appears also as a marvellous child. The story in *1 Enoch* 106–107 says: "And after (some) days my son Methuselah took for his son Lamech a wife, and she became pregnant by him and bore a son. And his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head (was) white like wool…and his eyes (were) beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright. And when he was taken from the hand of the midwife, he opened his mouth and spoke to the Lord of Righteousness. And his father Lamech was afraid of him and fled and went to his father Methuselah. And he said to him: 'I have begotten a strange son; he is not like a man, but is like the children of the angels of heaven, of a different type, and not like us. And his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious. And it seems to me that he is not sprung from me, but from angels.'" M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2,244–245.

[34] M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 129; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 185.

[35] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.29.

[36] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.29.

[37] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.29–31.

On the other hand, in *2 Enoch* Sothonim did not explain the circumstances of the conception. She answered Nir: "O my lord! Behold, it is the time of my old age, and there was not in me any (ardor of) youth and I do not know how the indecency of my womb has been conceived."[38] However, some scholars draw attention to the fact that both texts have similar features in this situation. Delcor affirms that the phrase of Lamech in the beginning of *the Apocryphon*, "Behold, then I thought in my heart that the conception was the work of the Watchers and the pregnancy, of the Holy Ones…" can be compared with the words of Noah in *2 Enoch* spoken at the time of the examination of Melchizedek: "This is of the Lord, my brother."[39] An important supporting detail here is the fact that the description of Enoch and his descendants in *Genesis Apocryphon* shows a number of interesting similarities with *2 Enoch's* story.

Chapters 39–66 of *2 Enoch* describe the instruction which Enoch gave to his sons and the elders of the people during his thirty day visit to the earth. The text makes clear that during this visit Enoch is already an angelic being. In chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* he says to his son: "Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food."[40]

Chapter 67 of *2 Enoch* describes the final departure of Enoch to heaven. The information about the transformed Enoch can be found also in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The text says that when Methuselah knew about Lamech's suspicions he decided to ask advise from Enoch. The *Genesis Apocryphon* continues that "he (Methuselah) left for the higher level, to Parvaim, and there he met Enoch, [his father…]."[41] This reference to the "higher level" can be considered as a hint for the elevated status of the translated Enoch. *Apocryphon* further says that "He (Methuselah) said to Enoch, his father: O my father and lord, to whom I have co[me…] […] I say to you: Do not be annoyed with me because I came here to […] you […] fear (?) before you […]."[42] Methuselah's

---

[38] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 205.

[39] Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," 129.

[40] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 183.

[41] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.31.

[42] F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.31.

fear before Enoch is an additional supporting detail that he in fact met not a man, but a heavenly being.

Another feature of *2 Enoch* which shows some possible connection between this text and the sectarian Judaism is the issue of animal sacrifices. The description of animal sacrifices occupies a very important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. In chapter 59, Enoch instructed Methuselah, his brothers—Regim, Ariim, Akhazukhan, Kharimion—and the elders of all the people how to perform animal sacrifices: "… he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul. And everything which you have for food, bind it by four legs;[43] there is healing, he heals his soul. He who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil custom; he acts lawlessly with his own soul."[44] Further the book tells that right after the appointment of Methuselah to the position of the priest he came up to the Lord's altar "with all the people in procession behind him and he stood in front of the altar with all the people … around the altar … and … the elders of the people, … taking sheep and oxen … tied (their) four legs together, and placed (them) at the head of the altar."[45] S. Pines draws attention to this unique practice of tying together four legs during animal sacrifices. He refers to a passage in the Mishna (*m.* Tamid, 4:1) which, according to the most probable interpretation, states that each of the forelegs of the sacrificial animal was tied to the corresponding hind leg and declares that the tying together of all the four legs was contrary to the tradition.[46] Pines gives one of the two explanations found in the Gemara of the Babli that this expression of disapproval was due to the fact that the customs of the heretics, *minim*,[47] should not be imitated.[48] The practice of tying together all four legs had very strong sectarian meaning for the authors of Mishnaic sacrificial prescriptions. In his final conclusion, Pines suggests that "it may have been an accepted rite of a sect, which repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in Jerusalem. It might be conjectured that this sect might have been the

---

[43] Slav. **свѧжете є по четꙑре ноги.**

[44] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 185.

[45] Andersen, "2 Enoch," 199.

[46] S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *Types of Redemption* (eds. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 74–75.

[47] *b.* Tamid 31b.

[48] Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," 75.

Essenes, whose sacrificial usage differed according to the one reading of the passage of Josephus[49] from those practiced at the Temple."[50]

Sethian Traditions

Shlomo Pines' reference to sacrificial practices of "*minim*," heretics, which were usually represented in the Jewish orthodox mindset as Jewish Gnostics,[51] necessitated further examination of the relationship between the Melchizedek story of *2 Enoch* and some Gnostic traditions. One of the tractates of the Nag Hammadi corpus, *Melchizedek* (further *Melch.*) deserves special attention because it contains materials that echo certain motifs in *2 Enoch*'s story.[52] The text has a form of revelations given by heavenly intermediaries to Melchizedek who communicates the revelations to a privileged few, "the congregation (ἐκκλησία) of [the] [children] of Seth (5:19–20)."[53] According to scholars, *Melch.* has important similar features with traditions associated with Sethian gnosticism.[54] It is possible that the author of the tractate reworked some earlier Jewish Melchizedek's traditions into gnostic Christian settings.[55] In spite of the fragmentary character of the tractate, there are a number of important details which can be connected with Melchizedek's story in *2 Enoch*. Two features of the Gnostic text are especially valuable. First, the author's use of the phrase "the children of Seth" (5:20), and second, his usage of the phrase "the [race] (γένος) of the High priest (ἀρχιερεύς)

[49] *Ant.* 18, 18.

[50] Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," 75.

[51] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1991), 359.

[52] The issue of possible connections between the Nag Hammadi texts and the Enochic tradition can be clarified by reference to some patristic materials. As we know, the place of discovery of the Nag Hammadi library was close to the former site of the Pachomian monastery at Chenoboskion. The following condemnation of the "apocryphal books" was made by patriarch Athanasius and recorded in the Pachomian *Lives*: "Who has made the simple folk believe that these books belong to Enoch even though no scriptures existed before Moses?" Cit. in D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Ascetism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 330.

[53] Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (NHS, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 51.

[54] Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 36.

[55] Pearson stresses the fact that Jewish apocalyptic elements are prominent in *Melch.* He argues that "it might be suggested that *Melch.* is a Jewish-Christian product containing an originally pre-Christian Melchizedek speculation overlaid with Christian christological re-interpretation." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 34.

(6:17)."[56] These details seem to have certain parallels with Melchizedek's narrative of *2 Enoch*, which contains materials about priestly functions of Seth. In chapter 72 of the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the following statement comes from the lips of the Lord: "… and Melchizedek will be the head of the priests in another generation as was Seth in this generation."[57] The author's familiarity with the traditions which exalted Seth, however, become evident much earlier in chapter 33:10 where the Lord promises to give Enoch an intercessor archangel Michael and guardian angels Arioch and Marioch on account of his handwritings and the handwritings of his fathers—Adam and Seth.[58] Mentioning all three traditions together shows that Sethian tradition has in the eyes of *2 Enoch*'s author equal value to the tradition of Adam and Enoch.

Melch. also gives an interesting list which includes Adam, Enoch, and Melchizedek.[59] Birger Pearson suggests that "the list of biblical figures mentioned in this passage, culminating with Melchizedek, may be intended as a list of those heroes of the past who functioned as priests."[60]

Another important testimony to Sethian tradition is found in chapter 71 where the author of *2 Enoch* depicts a priestly line which begins with Seth: "Therefore honor him (Melchizedek) together with your servants and great priests, with Seth, and with Enoch, and Maleleil, and Aamilam, and Phrasidam, and with Maleleil, and with Rusif and with Enoch and with your servant Nir…"[61]

These testimonies to Sethian tradition show that there are obvious similarities between *Melch.* and *2 Enoch.* Both stories emphasize

---

[56] Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 53.

[57] "I Melkisedek boude glava iereem v rode tom jako zhe bo mi Sif v rode sem." Cf. Manuscripts [B] and [Rum] in: M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih (COIDR)* 4 (1910), 106 and 155.

[58] Andersen, 157.

[59] "…of Adam [Abel], Enoch, [Noah] you, Melchizedek, [the Priest] of God [Most High] (12:7–11)." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 63.

[60] Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 25. Pearson supports his hypothesis by referring to the list of priests in the Hellenistic-Jewish synagogue prayer quoted in *Const. Ap.* VIII.5.3, which includes Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, and Melchizedek.

[61] Manuscript [B]. Cf. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910), 106.

priestly functions of Seth in their connections with priestly functions of Melchizedek. It is noteworthy that this emphasis on priestly role of Seth is a rare motif in Sethian traditions. In the variety of Sethian traditions, Seth is often pictured as an astrologer, a scribe, or the head of a generation, but he is rarely viewed as a priest.[62]

From the other side, despite these parallels,[63] there is a fundamental divergence between *Melch.* and *2 Enoch.* The purpose of the author of *Melch.* is apparent—to place Melchizedek in the context of Sethian priestly authority. In observations on the tractate, B. Pearson stresses that because of the reference to the "children of Seth" (5:20), and the parallel reference to the "race of the high priest" (i.e. *Melch.* 6:17), it is possible that in *Melch.*, the priest-savior Melchizedek is regarded as an earthly incarnation of the heavenly Seth.[64] On the contrary, in *2 Enoch*, however, there is an established attempt to challenge the Sethian priestly line and replace it with a new postdiluvian priestly authority of Melchizedek.

---

[62] On the figure of Seth and Sethian traditions cf. A. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT, 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977); R. Kraft, "Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth and His Progeny?" *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.457–458; G. MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24–43; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.472–504; M. Stone, "Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 2.459–471.

[63] Several additional parallels between *2 Enoch* and *Melch.*, which were noticed by Pearson should also be mentioned. According to Pearson's hypothesis in both texts Melchizedek appears in several historical manifestations. Pearson rightly observes that in *Slavonic Enoch* Melchizedek "has three different manifestations: miraculously born before the Flood, serving in the post-diluvian age as a great priest, and functioning as a priest in the end-time, i.e. in messianic capacity." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 30. Pearson also notes that in *Melch.* Melchizedek appears in several roles: "as ancient priest and recipient of heavenly revelations of the eschatological future, and as eschatological savior-priest identified with Jesus Christ." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 20.

According to Pearson, another parallel between *2 Enoch* and *Melch.* is that both texts belong to the genre "apocalypse." Pearson notes that *Melch.* "satisfies the generic requirements of an apocalypse: it is pseudonymous, attributed to a biblical hero of the past, and contains purported prophecies of future events given by an angelic informant, as well as secrets pertaining to the heavenly world, presumably in a visionary experience." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 20.

[64] B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, 498.

Conclusion

The fragmentary character of our observations about the Melchizedek legend does not allow for the complete picture of the possible cultural, historical, or theological provenance of Melchizedek's story in *2 Enoch* to be considered. However, some conclusions can be made at this stage of the research. These conclusions focus on the problem of the hypothetical community behind the Melchizedek narrative.

First, the Melchizedek portion demonstrates the interest in the issues of priestly practice, succession and authority, which occupy an important part in the eschatology of *2 Enoch*.

Second, the material reflects complicated polemics with various traditions of priestly practice and the priestly succession inside Judaism.

Third, the story of Melchizedek, this *sacerdos in aeternum*, is used in *2 Enoch* as well as in many other traditions as the theological tool of legitimization of alternative priestly authority (line).

Fourth, it is possible that in the text we can see a specific attitude toward the priestly authority (hierocracy) connected with the Temple in Jerusalem.[65] The important supporting detail here is naming the place of sacrificial duties of Enoch's descendants as Achuzan.[66] This may also be the main reason for the replacement of official priestly line Noah-Shem to the line Nir-Melchizedek, as a legitimate background for the new sectarian priestly authority.

Fifth, the Melchizedek material of *2 Enoch* was probably composed in a community which respected the authority of the Jewish lore (the opinion about Enoch's ancestors as predecessors of Melchizedek). This community might have had certain liturgical and theological differences (sectarian biases) from the mainstream of Second Temple Judaism.

---

[65] The question of the relationship between *2 Enoch* and the temple in Leontopolis remains open. A possible Alexandrian provenance of *Slavonic Enoch* could give additional support to this hypothesis. Cf. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*, 40–41; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 42–45. On the relationship between Leontopolis, Jerusalem, and Qumran see: J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula: University of Montana, 1974), 48–55; R. Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982) 429–443; S. Steckoll, "Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis," *RevQ* 6 (1967) 55–69.

[66] It is interesting to note that the text specifies the place of the future priestly vocation of Melchizedek—"He, Melchizedek will be a priest and a king on the place Achuzan, i.e. the center of the world, where Adam was created." Vaillant, 116.

Sixth, the community of *2 Enoch* apparently repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in traditional Judaism (Jerusalem) (the tying together of all the four legs of the animals during the sacrifices).

Seventh, liturgical (priesthood line) and exegetical (Noah, Melchizedek) features of the Melchizedek portion of *2 Enoch* have certain similarities to the ideology of the Qumran community (an alternative priestly line, exegesis of Noah, and Melchizedek's story). It is evident, however, that the ideological and theological settings of the document cannot be explained solely by referring to the Qumran materials because of an absence of major Jewish symbols and themes which occupied a central place in the ideology of the Qumranites.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. *Reference Works*

Avanesov, R.I., ed., *Словарь древнерусского языка* (*XI–XIV вв.*) (10 vols.; Москва: Русский Язык, 1988ff.).

Barhudarov, Sergei G., ed., *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII веков* (25 vols.; Москва: Наука, 1975ff.).

Cejtlin, R.M., ed., *Старославянский словарь* (*по рукописям X–XI веков*) (Москва: Русский Язык, 1999).

Jastrow, Marcus, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1985 [New York: Shalom, 1967]).

Kurz, Josef, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae)* (4 vols.; Prague, 1958–1992).

Schäfer, Peter et al., *Konkordanz zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (2 vols; TSAJ 12,13; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1986–1988).

Sokoloff, Michael, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1990).

Sreznevskij, Izmail, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам* (3 vols.; С-Петербург, 1883–1912) [repr. *Словарь древнерусского языка* (3 vols.; Москва: Книга, 1989)].

II. *Texts and Translations*

Aberbach, M. and B. Grossfeld, eds., *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text* (New York: Ktav, 1982).

Alexander, Philip, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.223–315.

Andersen, Francis, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.91–221.

Anderson, Gary, A., and Stone, Michael, E., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (SBLEJL, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999).

Berthold, H., ed., *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; GCS; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1973).

Beyer, K. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

—, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

Black, Matthew, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

Bonwetsch, G. Nathaniel, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG.PH Neue Folge Bd.1 Nr.3; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896).
—, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1922).
Böttrich, Christfried, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ Band V Lieferung 7; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995).
Bowman, John, ed., *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion, and Life* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977).
Buber, Solomon, ed., *Midrash Tanhuma* (3 vols.; Vilna: Romm, 1885).
Burchard, Christoph, "Joseph and Aseneth," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.177–247.
Charles, Robert Henry, and William Richard Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).
Charles, R.H., and N. Forbes, "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; ed. R.H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2. 425–469.
Cohen, Martin, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985).
Collins, John J., "Sibylline Oracles," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.317–472.
Colson, Francis Henry, and George Herbert Whitaker, eds., *Philo* (10 vols.; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929–1964).
Danby, Herbert, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
Desprez, V., *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homélies propres à la Collection III* (SC, 275; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980).
Díez Macho, A., *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968).
—, *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum* (5 vols.; Matriti: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1977).
Eisenstein, J.D., *Otzar midrashim* (2 vols.; New York: J.D. Eisenstein, 1915).
Epstein, Isidore, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*. (London: Soncino, 1935–1952).
Festugière, André J., *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (3 vols.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983).
Franko, Ivan, *Апокріфи і легенди з українських рукописів* (Monumenta Linguae Necnon Litterarum Ukraino-Russicarum [Ruthenicarum]; 1–5; 5 vols.; Львов, 1896–1910).
Freedman, Harry, and Maurice Simon, *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1961).
Friedländer, Gerald, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (2nd ed.; New York: Hermon Press, 1965).
García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997).
Gaster, Moses, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899).
Gaylord, Harry E., "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.653–679.

Grossfeld, B., (tr.), *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988).
Holladay, Carl, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (3 vols.; Texts and Translations 30; Pseudepigrapha Series 12; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983).
Jacobson, Howard, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
Jeffreys, E., M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986).
Jellinek, Adolf, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1967).
Klein, Michael L., *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980).
Klijn, Albertus F.J., "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.615–652.
Klostermann E. and H. Berthold, eds., *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Simeon aus Typus III* (TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961).
Knibb, Michael, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).
Kurfess, Alfons, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (München: Heimeren, 1951).
Lunt, H.G., "Ladder of Jacob," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.401–411.
McNamara, Martin, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (The Aramaic Bible, 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992).
Macdonald, John, *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah* (2 vols., BZAW, 84; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963).
Maher, Michael, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992).
Maloney, G.A., S.J., *Pseudo-Macarius. The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).
Marcus, Ralph, *Philo. Questions and Answers on Genesis* (Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press/Heinemann, 1949).
—, *Philo, Questions and Answers on Exodus* (Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press/Heinemann, 1949).
Margaliot, Reuven, ספר הזוהר (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940).
Milik, J.T., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).
Morgan, M., *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (TTPS, 11; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).
Mosshammer, A., ed., *Georgius Syncellus. Ecloga Chronographica* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1984).
Neusner, Jacob, *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana* (2 vols.; Brown Judaic Studies, 122–123; Atlanta; Scholars, 1987).
Odeberg, Hugo, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928]).
Paleja Tolkovaja, *Палея Толковая по списку, сделанному в Коломне в 1406 г. Труд учеников Н.С. Тихонравова* (Вып. 1–2; Москва, 1892–1896).
Palmer, G.E.H., Sherrard, P. and K. Ware, "Pseudo-Simeon, The Three

Methods of Prayer," in: *The Philokalia* (5 vols.; London: Faber and Faber, 1995) 4.67–75.
Pennington, A., "2 Enoch," in: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 321–362.
Picard, J.-C., *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece* (PVTG, 2; Leiden: Brill, 1967).
Pypin, Alexander N., *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862 [repr. Paris, 1970]).
Roberts A. and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950–1951).
Robertson, R.G., "Ezekiel the Tragedian," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.803–819.
Rousseau, Adelin, and Louis Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies. Livre I* (2 vols.; SC 263–264; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1979).
Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard, "Apocalypse of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.681–705.
Sanders, E.P., "Testament of Abraham," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.871–902.
Schäfer, Peter, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 6; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1984).
Schäfer, Peter, with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981).
Schäfer, Peter et al., *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (4 vols; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen, Mohr/Siebeck, 1987–1995).
Schiffman, Lawrence H. and Michael D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Semitic Texts and Studies, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).
Smith, J.Z., "Prayer of Joseph," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.699–714.
Sokolov, Matvej I., "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899) 1–112.
—, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910) 1–167.
Sparks, H.F., ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).
Sperber, A., ed., *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1959).
Sperling, Harry, and Maurice Simon, *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933).
Stuckenbruck, Loren, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997).
Thackeray, Henry St. J., and Ralph Markus, *Josephus* (10 vols.; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965).

Tihomirov, Michail N., *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).
Tihonravov, Nikolaj S., *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863 [repr. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 184/1–2; The Hague/Paris, 1970]).
Tolkovaja Paleja, *Толковая Палея 1477 года. Воспроизведение Синодальной рукописи 210* (Общество любителей древнерусской письменности, 93; С.-Петербург, 1893).
Tromp, Johannes, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993).
Vaillant, André, *Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4; Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1976 [1952]).
VanderKam, James, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO, 510–511; Scriptores Aethiopici 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).
Waldstein M. and F. Wisse, *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and VI, 1 with BG 8502, 2* (NMS, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1995).
Wintermute, O.S., "Jubilees," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 2.35–142.

III. *Secondary Literature*

Aaron, David H. "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299–314.
Abrams, Daniel, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead," *HTR* 87 (1994) 291–321.
Adler, William, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1989).
Adrianova, V., *К литературной истории Толковой Палеи* (Киев, 1910).
Alexander, Philip, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28–29 (1977–1978) 156–180.
—, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102–111.
—, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. C. Hempel et al., BETL, 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002) 223–243.
Altmann, Alexander, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1945) 371–391.
Amusin, Iosif D., "Новый эсхатологический текст из Кумрана (11Q Melchisedek)," *Вестник Древней Истории* 3 (1967) 45–62.
—, *Тексты Кумрана* (Памятники письменности Востока, 33/1; Москва: Наука, 1971).
—, *Кумранская Община* (Москва: Наука, 1983).
Andersen, Francis, "The Sun in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *Xristianskij Vostok* 4 (10) (2006) 380–412.

Anderson, Gary, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 83–110.

—, "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 3–42.

Anderson, Gary et al., *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000).

Aptowitzer, V. "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93–113.

Bailey, L. *Noah: The Person and the Story in History and Tradition* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1989).

Baillet, M. "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4; 'Les Paroles des Luminaires,'" *Revue Biblique* 67 (1961) 195–250.

—, "Remarques sur l'édition des Paroles des Luminaires," *RevQ* 5 (1964) 23–42.

—, *Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482–520)* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Balentine, Samuel E., *The Hidden God: The Hiding of the Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

Barc, Bernard, "La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premièrs siècles après J.-C.," *RSR* 49 (1975) 173–185.

Barr, J. "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VTSup* 7 (1959) 31–38.

Bauckham, Richard, "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," *JTS* 41 (1990) 355–385.

—, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (SNT, 93; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

Bernstein, M., "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199–231.

Bickerman, Elias J., "La chaîne de la tradition Pharisienne," *RB* 59 (1951) 44–54.

Bietenhard, Hans, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1951).

Black, Matthew, "The Origin of the Name Metatron," *VT* 1 (1951) 217–219.

—, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 174–179.

Bloch, René, "Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," in: *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance* (ed. H. Cazelles; Tounai, New York: Desclée, 1955) 93–167.

—, "Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition," in: *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963) 95–171.

Blumenthal, D. *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (2 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1978).

Boccaccini, Gabriele, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Bockmuehl, Markus, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT, 2/136; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1990).

Bonwetsch, G. Nathaniel, "Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch," *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1896), 91–101.

—, "Die Apokryphe 'Leiter Jakobs,'" *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (1900), 76–87.
Borsch, F., *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967).
Böttrich, Christfried, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).
—, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Judentum und Umwelt 59; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995).
—, "Beobachtungen zum Midrasch vom 'Leben Henochs,'" *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83.
—, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 445–470.
Brakke, D. *Athanasius and the Politics of Ascetism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
Bratke, E., *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden. Herausgegeben von Eduard Bratke* (TU, NS, 4.3; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899).
Brock, S. "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11–40.
Brooke, G.J., "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT, 118; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999) 285–299.
Burkitt, C., *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914).
Burrows, E., "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion," *The Labyrinth* (ed. S.H. Hooke; London, 1935) 45–59.
Campbell, A.F. and M.A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
Caquot, André, "La Divinité Solaire Ougaritique," *Syria* 36 (1959) 90–101.
—, "La Pérennité du sacerdoce," in: *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique. Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1978) 109–116.
Charles, Robert Henry, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–163.
Charlesworth, James H., "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315–323.
—, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in: J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (SCS, 12; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 135–151.
—, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCS, 7; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).
—, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (MSSNTS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
—, "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation," in J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans, eds., *Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSS, 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 20–43.

Charlesworth, James H. with James R. Mueller, *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series. Metuchen, NJ/London: American Theological Library Association and Scarecrow Press, 1987).

Chernus, Ira, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Studia Judaica, 11; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1982).

Chesnutt, Randall D., *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (JSPSup 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Childs, B.S., *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974).

Clark, Elizabeth A., "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *Church History* 59 (1990) 145–162.

—, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Coats, George Wesley, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup, 57; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).

Collins, John J., "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983).

—, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984).

Dan, Joseph, "The Seventy Names of Metatron," in *idem, Jewish Mysticism: Late Antiquity* (2 vols.; Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1998), 1.229–234.

—, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1993).

Daniélou, Jean, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago: Henry Regenery Company, 1964). [*Théologie du judéo-christianisme. Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée* (I; Tournai: Desclée & Cie, 1958)].

Davies, William D., "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 1.1:25–30," in W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962) 119–144.

Davila, James, "Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven," *SBLSP* 35 (1996) 259–272.

—, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 3–20.

—, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (JSJSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001).

—, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 248–274.

De Conick, April, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

—, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century," in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJSup, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999) 325–330.

De Conick, April, and Jarl Fossum, "Stripped before God; A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 123–150.
De Jonge, M. and A.S. van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965–1966) 301–326.
Delcor, Mathias, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 126–130.
—, "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave," *Kecharitomene. Mélanges René Laurentin* (ed. C. Augustin et al.; Paris: Desclée, 1990) 217–229.
Deutsch, Celia, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25–30* (JSNTSS, 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).
Deutsch, Nathaniel, *Guardians of the Gate. Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 22; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999).
Dimant, Devorah, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 123–150.
Dörries, H., E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964).
Ego, B., et al., eds., *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Temples und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT, 118; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999).
Eichrodt, W., *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961).
Elior, Rachel, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions," *JSQ* 4 (1997) 217–267.
—, "The Priestly Nature of the Mystical Heritage in Heykalot Literature," in: *Expérience et écriture mystiques dans les religions du livre: Actes d'un colloque international tenu par le Centre d'études juives Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne 1994* (eds. R.B. Fenton and R. Goetschel; EJM, 22; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 41–54.
Eppel, R., "Les tables de la loi et les tables célestes," *RHPhR* 17 (1937) 401–412.
Evans, C.A., "Aspect of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels," *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Concepts* (ed. J.M. Scott; JSJSup., 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 308–309.
Falk, D., *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1988).
Fauth, Wolfgang, "Tatrosjah-totrosjah und Metatron in der jüdischen Merkabah-Mystik," *JSJ* 22 (1991) 40–87.
Finkelstein, Louis, "Introductory Study to Pirke Abot," *JBL* 57 (1938) 13–50.
Fishbane, Michael, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115–121.
—, "The 'Measures' of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in I. Gruenwald et al., eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 53–74.
Fischer, Ulrich, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978).

Fitzmyer, J.A., S.J., "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," in: *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBLSBS, 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 245–267.
—, "Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2Cor 3:7–4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif," *JTS* 42 (1981) 630–644.
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T., "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996) 236–252.
—, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, 2/94; Tubingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997).
—, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
Flusser, D., "Palaea Historica—An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends," *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971) 51–52.
Fotheringham, J.K., "The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 20 (1919) 252.
Fossum, Jarl, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Mediation Concepts and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985).
—, "Colossians 1.15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201.
—, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).
—, "The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis,"
Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag (3 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1996) 1.529–539.
Fraade, Stephen, *Enosh and His Generation* (SBLMS, 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1984).
Friedländer, M., *Der vorchristliche Jüdische Gnostizismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898).
Fujita, S., "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 30–45.
Gammie, J., "Loci of the Melchizedek Tradition of Gen. 14:18–20," *JBL* 90 (1971) 385–396.
García Martínez, Florentino, "4Q Amram B 1:14; ¿Melkiresa o Melkisedeq?" *RevQ* 12 (1985) 111–114.
—, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992).
—, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (eds. M. Albani et al.; TSAJ, 65; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 243–260.
—, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 86–108.
Gaylord, H.E., "How Sataniel Lost His '-el,'" *JJS* 33 (1982) 303–309.
—, "Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha," *Polata knigopisnaja* 7 (1983) 49–56.

—, "The Slavonic Version of III Baruch" (Ph.D. diss., Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983).
—, "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch," *Slovo* 37 (1987) 91–115.
Gianotto, G., *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche* (sec II a.C.-sec. III d.C) (SrivB, 12; Brescia: Paideia, 1984).
Gieschen, Charles A., *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU, 42; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998).
Ginzberg, Louis, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955).
Glickler Chazon, E., *"Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam): A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications* (Ph.D. dissertation, Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991).
—, "4QDibHam: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1991–1992) 447–455.
—, "'Dibre Hammêorot': Prayer for the Sixth Day (4Q504 1–2 v–vi)," *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (eds. M. Kiley et al.; London, New York: Routledge, 1997) 23–27.
—, "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays* (eds. J. Frishman and L. van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca, 5; Lovain: Peeters, 1997).
Gluck, T., *The Arabic Legend of Seth, the Father of Mankind* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1968).
Golitzin, Alexander, "Forma lui Dumnezeu şi vederea slavei. Reflecţii asupra controversei antropomorfite din anul 399 d. Hr.," in: Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), *Mistagogia. Experienţa lui Dumnezeu în ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998) 184–267.
—, "Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159–186.
—, *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I, 3* (forthcoming).
Gordon, Cyrus, "Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums," *Archiv Orientálni* 6 (1934) 319–335.
—, "Aramaic and Mandaic Magical Bowls," *Archiv Orientálni* 9 (1937) 84–95.
Goshen-Gottstein, Alon, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171–195.
Gould, Graham, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphite Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in Robert J. Daly, ed., *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 549–557.
Greenfield, Jonas C., "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) xi–xlvii.
—, "The Aramaic and Greek Fragments of a Levi Document," in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge; SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1985).
Grelot, Pierre, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5–26, 181–210.
Gruenwald, Ithamar, "The Messianic Image of Melchizedek," *Mahanayim* 124 (1970) 88–98 (in Hebrew).

—, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980).
Gruenwald, I. and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).
Grünbaum, M., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach-und Sagenkunde* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1901).
Gry, L. "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195–203.
Hafemann, Scott J., "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79–104.
Hage, W., "*Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse*," in: *Apokalypsen* (ed. W. Hage, K.-G. Eckart, et al.; JSHRZ, 5/1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974) 15–44.
Halperin, David, J., *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven, American Oriental Society, 1980).
—, "A New Edition of the Hekhalot Literature," *JAOS* 104.3 (1984) 543–552.
—, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988).
Hannah, Darrell D., *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, 2/109; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999).
Haran, Menahem, "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29–35; Ps. 69:32; Hab 3:4]," in: *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOTSup, 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984) 159–173.
—, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30–38.
Harlow, D., *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christiantity* (SVTP, 12; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1996).
Hayward, R., "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982) 429–443.
Hempel, J., "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75–85.
Hengel, Martin, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
—, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).
Henning, W.B., "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943–1946) 52–74.
Hennessey, Lawrence, "A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three Senses of Incorporeality," in Robert J. Daly, ed., *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 373–380.
Hercigonja, E., "'Videnie Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63–93.
Himmelfarb, Martha, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature," *SBLSP* 13 (1978) 259–269.
—, "The Experience of the Visionary and the Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6–11 and the Apocalypse of Paul," *Semeia* 36 (1986) 97–111.
—, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987) 210–217.
—, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira," in: *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (eds. J. Scott and P. Simpson-Housley; New York: Greenwood Press, 1991) 63–78.

—, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
Holladay, Carl R., "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBLSP* 10 (1976) 447–452.
Horton, F., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS, 30; Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University, 1976).
Hurtado, Larry, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
Idel, Moshe, *The Mystical Experience of Abraham Abulafia* (tr. J. Chipman; Albany: SUNY, 1988).
—, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240.
—, "Metatron-Comments on the Development of Jewish Myth," in: *Myth in Jewish Thought* (ed. H. Pedayah; Beer Sheva: Beer Sheva University Press, 1996), 29–44.
Istrin, V.M., "Редакции Толковой Палеи," *Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 10/4 (1905) 150–151.
Ivanov, J., *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofija: Pridvorna Pechatnica, 1925).
Jacimirskij, A.I. *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921).
Jacob, E., *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1955).
Jacobs, L., *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977).
James, M.R., "Ladder of Jacob," in *idem, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED, 14; London: SPCK, 1920) 96–103.
Janowitz, N., *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).
Janowski, B., *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils* (WMANT, 59; Neukirchen–Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1989).
Jervell, Jacob, *Imago Dei: Gen 1:26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen* (FRLANT, 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
Kahana, Abraham, "Sefer Hanok B," in: *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah* (Jerusalem, 1936) 102–141.
Kapera, Z.J., ed., *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992).
Kaplan, C., "The Angel of Peace, Uriel–Metatron," *Anglican Theological Review* 13 (1931) 306–313.
Karpov, A. Ju., "О календаре славянской книги 'Откровение Варуха,'" *Палестинский Сборник* 32 (1993) 81–83.
Klijn, A.F.J., *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT, 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977).
Knibb, Michael, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995) 177–180.
Kobelski, P., *Melchizedek and Melchireša*ᶜ (CBQMS, 10; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981).
Korpel, M.C.A., *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8; Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990).
Kraft, R., "Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth

and His Progeny?" *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 2.457–458.
Kugel, James, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–227.
Kuhn, K.G., "Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 163–234.
Kuiper, K., "Le poète juif Ezéchiel," *Revue des études juives* 46 (1903) 174.
Kuz'min, A.G. and A. Ju. Karpov, *Златоструй. Древняя Русь X–XIII вв.* (Москва: Молодая Гвардия, 1990).
Kvanvig, Helge, S., *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).
Lake, Kirsopp, "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397–398.
Lambert, Wilfred G., "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967) 126–138.
Langer, B., *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60:1–3.19f.* (Österreichische biblische Studien, 7; Klosterneuburg: Verlag Österreichisches Katholische Bibelwerk, 1989).
Lavrov, P.A., "Откровение Варуха," *Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности* 67/3 (1899) 149–151.
—, "Заметка об апокрифах в рукописи Публичной библиотеки греч. 70," *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61–64.
Levison, J.R., *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).
Lewis, Jack P., *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).
Lieberman, Saul, **שקיעין** (Jerusalem: Bamberger et Vahrman, 1939).
—, "Metatron, the Meaning of his Name and his Functions," in: Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 235–241.
Ludin Jansen, Herman, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939).
Lüdtke, W., "Beiträge zu slavischen Apokryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 218–231.
Mach, Michael, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).
MacRae, G., "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24–43.
Maier, Johann, "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und 'Gnosis,'" *Kairos* 5(1) (1963) 18–40.
—, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Kairos 1; Salzburg: Müller, 1964).
Marmorstein, Arthur, "Midrash Abkir," *Debir* 1 (1923) 113–144.
—, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism* (New York: KTAV, 1937).
Markus, J., *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).
Martini, R., *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos* (Lipsiae: Sumptibus haeredum F. Lanckisi, 1687).
Martin, R.P., *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

Maunder, A.S.D., "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309–316.
McCullough, William S., *Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Texts in the Royal Ontario Museum* (Near and Middle East Series, 5; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).
McGuckin, John A., *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986).
—, "The Changing Forms of Jesus," in Lothar Lies, ed., *Origeniana Quarta* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, Bd. 19; Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrola-Verlag, 1987) 215–222.
McNamara, M., *Intertestamental Literature* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983).
Meeks, Wayne, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967).
—, "Moses as God and King," in: *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; SHR, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 354–371.
Meshcherskij, Nikita A., "Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963) 130–147.
—, "К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе)," *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964) 91–108.
—, "К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха," *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965) 72–78.
Mettinger, Tryggve N.D., *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982).
Meyer, W., "Vita Adae et Evae," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philsoph.-philologische Klasse 14.3* (Munich, 1878) 185–250.
Michaeli, F., *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950).
Michel, O., "Melchizedek," *TDNT* 4.568–571.
Moore, George F., "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron," *HTR* 15 (1922) 41–85.
Moore, Michael S., *The Balaam Traditions: Their Character and Development* (SBLDS 113; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990).
Mopsik, Charles, *Le Livre hébreu d'Hénoch ou Livre des palais* (Paris: Verdier, 1989).
Morfill, W.R., "The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavonic," *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (Texts 5/1; ed. J.A. Robinson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897) 95–102.
Morray-Jones, Christopher R.A., "Hekhalot Literature and Talmudic Tradition: Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JSJ* 22 (1991) 1–39.
—, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31.
—, *A Transparent Illusion: The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism: A Source-critical and Tradition-historical Inquiry* (JSJSup 59; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
Mozley, J.H., "The Vita Adae," *JTS* 30 (1929) 121–149.

Munoa, Philip B., *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSup 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
Murmelstein, B., "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255.
Murtonen, Aimo E., "The Figure of Metatron," *VT* 3 (1953) 409–411.
Newsom, C.A., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985).
—, "4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition," *The Dead Sea Scroll: Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant, and U. Rappaport; STDJ, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 40–52.
Nickelsburg, George, W.E., "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600.
—, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).
—, "The Books of Enoch in Recent Research," *RSR* 7 (1981) 210–217.
Niditch, Susan, "The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature," *JJS* 34 (1983) 137–146.
Nitzan, B., *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ, 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994).
Noth, M., *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972).
Novaković, St., "Otkrivene Varuhovo," *Starine* 18 (1886) 203–209.
Odeberg, Hugo, "Föreställningarna om Metatron i äldre judisk mystic," *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* 27 (1927) 1–20.
—, "Enoch," *TDNT* 2.556–560.
Oesterley, William O.E., and George H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920).
Olson, D.T., "Words of the Lights (4Q504–4Q506)," *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation. Vol. 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth and H.W.L. Rietz; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 107–153.
Olyan, Saul, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993).
Orlov, Andrei A., *"Merkabah Stratum" of the Short Recension of 2 Enoch* (M.A. Thesis; Abilene Christian University, 1995).
—, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71–86.
—, "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.
—, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *SBLSP* 39 (2000) 130–147.
—, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23–38.
—, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–273.
—, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *JSP* 21 (2000) 19–26.
—, "Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: 'Two Tablets' Traditions from the Book of Giants to Palaea Historica," *JSJ* 32 (2001) 137–158.
—, "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies," in: "Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)" *Xristianskij Vostok* 4.10 (2006) 498–513.

—, "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and the Book of Giants," *CBQ* 65 (2003) 184–201.
—, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *JSJ* 34 (2003) 274–303.
—, *From Patriarch to the Youth: The Metatron Tradition in 2 Enoch* (Ph.D. diss.; Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2003).
—, "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Henoch* 26.2 (2004) 172–187.
—, "Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and the Merkabah Tradition," *JSP* 14.1 (2004) 3–24.
—, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in: *Of Scribes and Sages* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76.
Orlov, Andrei and Alexander Golitzin, "'Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One': Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies," *VC* 55 (2001) 281–298.
Paul, S.M., "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life," *JANES* 5 (1973) 345–352.
Paulsen, David L., "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105–116.
Pearson, Birger, "The Figure of Melchizedek in the First Tractate of the Unpublished Coptic-Gnostic Codex IX from Nag Hammadi," *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion* (Supplements to Numen, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 200–208.
—, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 2.472–504.
—, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
Petuchowski, J., "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," *HUCA* 28 (1957) 127–136.
Philonenko, Marc, "La cosmogonie du 'livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in: *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109–116.
Philonenko-Sayar, B., "La version slave de l'Apocalypse de Baruch," *La littérature intertestamentaire*: *Colloque de Strasbourg, 17–19 octobre 1983* (Bibliothèque des centres d'études supérieures spécialisés: Travaux du Centre d'études supérieures spécialisé d'histoire des religions de Strasbourg; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1985) 89–97.
Pines, Shlomo, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in: *Types of Redemption* (eds. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72–87.
Porfir'ev, I. Ja. *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям соловецкой библиотеки.* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, 17.1; С.-Петербург, 1877).
Propp, William H.C., "The Skin of Moses' Face—Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375–386.
Puech, É., *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future* (2 vols.; Paris, 1993).

—, *Qumrân Grotte 4 (XXII): Textes Araméens, Première Partie, 4Q529–549* (DJD, 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001).
Quinn, Esther C., *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).
Quispel, Gilles, *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (SNT, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1967).
—, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1–13.
Rappaport, S., *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1930).
Reed, Annette Yoshiko, "From Asael and Semihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (par. 7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch," *JSQ* 8.2 (2001) 105–136.
Reeves, John, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992).
—, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110–115.
—, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," in: *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994) 173–203.
—, *Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).
Reicke, B., "Da^{c}at and Gnosis in Intertestamental Literature," *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox; Edinburg: Clark, 1969) 245–255.
Reindl, Joseph, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS, 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970).
Repp, F., "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des cod. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek," *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 58–68.
Ringgren, H., "Qumran and Gnosticism," *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo* (ed. U. Bianchi; SHR, 12; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 379–388.
Romanides, John S., "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960–1961) 186–205 and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963–1964) 225–270.
Rowland, Christopher, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).
—, "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition," *NTS* 30 (1984) 498–507.
—, "Enoch," in: *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (eds. K. van der Toorn et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 302.
Rowley, H.H., ed., *A Companion to the Bible* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963).
—, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps. 110)," *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1950) 461–472.
Rubinstein, A., "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21.
Sacchi, Paolo, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSup, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
Sachs, M., *Beiträge zur Sprach-und Alterthumsforschung* (Berlin, 1852).

Saldarini, Anthony J., "The End of the Rabbinic Chain of Tradition," *JBL* 93 (1974) 97–106.
—, *Scholastic Rabbinism: A Literary Study of the Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).
Salmina, M.A., "Лествица Иакова," in: D.S. Lihachev, ed., *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 230–231.
de Santos Otero, Aurelio, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (ed. A. Díez Macho; 4 vols.; Madrid: Ediciones Christiandad, 1984) 4.147–202.
Schäfer, Peter, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (SJ, 8; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975).
—, "Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Edition und Analyse der Merkava Rabba," *FJB* 5 (1977) 65–99.
—, "Die Beschwörung des sar ha-panim. Kritische Edition und Übersetzung," *FJB* 6 (1978) 107–145.
—, "Aufbau und redaktionelle Identität der Hekhalot Zutarti," *JJS* 33 (1982) 569–582.
—, "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 172–181.
—, "Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur," in: P. Schäfer, *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ, 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 250–276.
—, "Handschriften zur Hekhalot-Literatur," in: P. Schäfer, *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ, 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 154–233.
—, "The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism. Gershom Scholem Reconsidered," in: *Hekhalot-Studien*, 277–295. [*Gershom Scholem Reconsidered: The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism. The Twelfth Sacks Lecture Delivered on 29th May 1985* (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1986) 1–21.].
—, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1992).
Schalit, A., *Untersuchungen zur Assumptio Mosis* (ALGHJ, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1989).
Schlatter, A., *Die Theologie der Apostel* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922).
Schmidt, Nathaniel, "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *JAOS* 41 (1921) 307–312.
Scholem, Gershom, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1954).
—, "Die Lehre vom 'Gerechten' in der jüdischen Mystik," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 27 (1958) 252.
—, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965).
—, "Metatron," *EJ* 11.1443–1446.
—, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset Press, 1987).
—, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987) [*Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (SJ, 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962)].
—, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1991).
Scopello, M., "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *VC* 34 (1980) 367–385.
Scott, James M., "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of

Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup, 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 368–381.
Scroggs, R., *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966).
Séd, Nicolas, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49–66.
—, "La shekinta et ses amis araméens," *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 20 (1988) 133–142.
Segal, Alan, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977).
Simon, M., "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* (1937) 58–93.
Skjærvø, P.O., "Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of Giants. Irano-Manichaica III," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XLVIII (1–2) (1995) 187–223.
Smelik, W., "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism," *JSJ* 26 (1995) 122–144.
Smith, Mark S., "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171–183.
—, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990).
—, "The Near Eastern Background of Solar Language for Yahweh," *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29–39.
Smith, R., "Abram and Melchizedek (Gen. 14, 18–20)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* LXXXVII (1965) 129–153.
Sokolov, Matvej I., "Феникс в апокрифах об Енохе и Варухе," *Новый сборник статей по славяноведению, составленный и изданный учениками В.И. Ламанского* (С.-Петербург, 1905) 395–405.
—, "О фениксе по апокрифическим книгам Еноха и Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4/1 (Москва, 1907) 9–10.
—, "Апокрифическое откровение Варуха," *Древности. Труды Славянской Комиссии Московского Археологического Общества* 4.1 (Москва, 1907) 201–258.
Speranskij, M.N., *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей* (Москва: 1960).
Speyer, W., *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 110–124.
Staerk, W., Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938).
Stähli, H.P., *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 66; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).
Steckoll, S., "Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis," *RevQ* 6 (1967) 55–69.
Stein, B., *Der Begriff "Kebod Jahweh"* (Emsdetten; Lechte, 1939).
Steiner, R.S., "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66–71.

Stichel, Rainer, *Die Namen des Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau: Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der ausserkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (ADAWG, 112; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
—, "Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse," in *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (ed. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3/177; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 116–128.
Stone, Michael E., "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (eds. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, and P.D. Miller, Jr.; New York: Doubleday, 1967) 414–452.
—, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479–492.
—, "Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; SHR, 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 2.459–471.
—, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets* (Jerusalem, 1982).
—, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984).
—, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19 (1988) 159–170.
—, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to Armenian Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).
—, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* 44 (1993) 143–156.
—, "Noah, Books of," *EJ* 12.1198.
—, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996).
—, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133–149.
—, "Selections from 'On the Creation of the World' by Yovhannes Tulkuranci," *Literature on Adam and Eve* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 167–214.
—, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 111–132.
Stone M.E. and T.A. Bergren, eds., *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998).
Stork, H., *Die sogenannten Melchizedekianer mit Untersuchungen ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, 8/2; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1928).
Strack H.L. and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1991).
Stroumsa, Gedialahu, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983) 269–288.
—, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* 13 (1983) 345–358.

—, "Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème: l'Apocryphon de Jean et ses sources," *VC* 35 (1988) 412–434.
Stuckenbruck, Loren, *Angel Veneration and Christology* (WUNT, 2/70; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1995).
—, "The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition," *JSP* 16 (1997) 3–24.
Strugnell, J., "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSS, 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 221–256.
Sundermann, Werner, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch," *Hommages et opera minora 9: Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica 23/Second Series 9; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 491–505.
Suter, David, W., *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS, 47; Missoula: Scholars, 1979).
Svjatskij, D., *Лестница Иакова или сон наяву* (С-Петербург: Стасюлевич, 1911) 31–32.
Swartz, Michael, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (TSAJ, 28; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).
—, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).
Thrall, M.E., "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969–1970) 305–317.
Tihomirov, M.N., *Мерило Праведное по рукописи XIV века* (Москва: АН СССР, 1961).
Tihonravov, N., "Откровение Варуха," in: *Апокрифические сказания* (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, LVIII:4; С.-Петербург, 1894) 48–54.
Tiller, Patrick, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993).
—, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4.3 (1997) 312–313.
Tishby, Isaiah, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: An Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989).
Toit Laubscher, F. du, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11 Q Melh 13b," *JSJ* 3 (1972) 46–51.
Turdeanu, É., "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *RHR* 69 (1950) 22–52, 176–218.
—, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: Leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1953) 47–52.
—, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave," *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23–48.
—, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (SVTP, 5; Leiden: Brill, 1981).
Tvorogov, O.V., "Палея Толковая," in: D.S. Lihachev, ed., *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (XI – первая половина XIV в.)* (Ленинград, 1987) 285–288.
—, "Палея историческая" in: D.S. Lihachev, ed., *Словарь книжников и*

книжности Древней Руси (*вторая половина XIV–XVI в.*) (Части 1 и 2; Ленинград, 1988–1989) 2.160–161.

Urbach, Ephraim, "The Traditions about Merkavah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period," in: *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (ed. E.E. Urbach et al.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967) 1–28 [in Hebrew].

—, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* (2 vols.; tr. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975).

Uspenskij, V.M., *Толковая Палея* (Казань, 1876).

Vajda, Georges, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *Journal Asiatique* 234 (1943–1945) 173–183.

—, "Pour le Dossier de Metatron," in: *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History Presented to A. Altmann* (eds. S. Stein and R. Loewe; University of Alabama Press, 1979) 345–354.

Van De Water, Rick, "Moses' Exaltation: Pre-Christian?" *JSP* 21 (2000) 59–69.

Van der Horst, Pieter Willem, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 21–29.

—, "Some Notes on the Exagoge of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 364–365.

Van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M., "The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature," *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuizen; TBN, 3; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 34–62.

VanderKam, James, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBLSP* 1 (1978) 229–251.

—, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980) 13–32.

—, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984).

—, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992) 213–231.

—, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 37–71," in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 169–191.

—, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995).

—, "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in: *The Bible at Qumran* (eds. P.W. Flint and T.H. Kim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 129–148.

Vassiliev, A., *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Москва, 1893).

Vermes, Geza, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies," *JJS* 26 (1975) 1–14.

—, "The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in J. Neusner, ed., *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA, 12.3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 159–166.

Weinfeld, Moshe, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

—, "כבוד," *TDOT*, 7. 22–38.
Weinstein, N., *Zur Genesis der Agada* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901).
Werman, Cana, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," in: *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 171–181.
Wicks, H., *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1971).
Wise, M.O., "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991–1992) 128.
Wolfson, Elliot R., *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).
—, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz," in: *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism* (eds. K.-E. Grözinger and J. Dan, Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995) 60–92.
—, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutic* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).
Wuttke, G., *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (BZNW, 5; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1927).
Zagrebin, B.V., "О происхождении и судьбе некоторых славянских палимпсестов Синая," in: *Из истории рукописных и старопечатных собраний Отдела рукописей и редких книг ГПБ* (*Исследования, обзоры, публикации*). *Сборник научных трудов* (Ленинград, 1979) 61–80.
Zimmern, Heinrich, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung," in: *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (eds. E. Schrader et al.; 2 vols., Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902–1903) 2.530–543.

INDEX OF SOURCES

Numbers in italics indicate passages which are cited only in the footnotes

A. Hebrew Bible

Genesis
1:2 186
1:4 *395*
1:26 *276*, 329, *332*, *335*
1:26–27 173, 260, 329
1:26–30 245
1:27 *282*, 331
2–11 289
2:8 299
2:19–20 245
3:21 329–330, *338*
4:4 363
5 *324*
5:1 *272*
5:22–24 324
5:24 *429*
5:26–31 *364*
6 120
6:8 *368*
6:13–21 368
7:1–5 368
8:20 363
9:26 430
11:10–26 429
14:17 429
14:18 *376*, 428–429
14:19 *376*, 428
25:7 430
28 399
32 399, *413*
32:25–33 *414*
32:27 415
32:30 *413*, *417*
32:31 413
35:18 *426*

Exodus
2:2 *395*
13:14–15 *414*
26:1 203
31–34 *111*
33 *244*, *280*, 311–312, 316–317, 318–319, 323, 325, *350*, *403*
33:11 311
33:14–15 311
33:18–23 172, 311, 315–316, *399*, 404
33:20 311, 318
33:22 318
33:22–23 353
34 273–274, 319–320, 351
34:29–35 320, *339*, 351
36:8, 35 203

Leviticus
11 *206*

Numbers
6 *392*
12:8 *319*

Deuteronomy
4:32 160
4:37 *414*
34:7 *282*, 331

1 Samuel
4:4 *272*

2 Samuel
6:2 *272*

1 Kings
6:29 203

2 Kings
19:15 *272*

2 Chronicles
3:7 203

Job
13:21 160
14:20 332

Psalms
17:15 316, *399*
49:13 *282*, 331
69:32 *320*, *339*
80:2 *272*
110:1 *376*, 428
110:4 *376*, 428
133:2–3 233
139:16 160

Proverbs
22:6 142

Song of Songs
5:2 233

Isaiah
6:1–4 405
34:11 *187*
41:5 *429*
49:3 *407*
63:9 *418*
63:12 355

Ezekiel
1:6 *217*
1:18 317, 404
1:26 273, 408, *411*
1:27 *403*
1:28 316
9 *139*
40–48 *204*
41:15–26 203
48:20–21 *363*, *389*

Daniel
7 *156*, *265*

Habakkuk
3:4 *320*, *339*

B. Apocrypha

Ben Sira
44:16 (Cairo Geniza Ms. B) 175
44:16–17 392
50 *392*
50:1 392
50:1–24 392
50:5–11 392
50:20 *392*
50:22 *392*

Wisdom of Solomon
10:1 *264*

C. Pseudepigrapha

Abel (Armenian)
113, 116–117
4.3–6 119
4.5 120

Apocalypse of Abraham
10:9 *221*
12 *221*
23:4–6 155

3 Baruch
2–5 289
4 *170*, *251*, 290–291, 297–299, 301–303, 305–308
4–5 *291*
4:3 *303*, *308*
4:6 291
4:7 297–298, 301
4:7–8 297, 299
4:7–15 292–293
4:8 299, 302
4:10 302–303

4:10–11 302–304
4:11–15 305
4:11–16 306
4:13–15 306
4:15 305
4:15–17 306
4:16 (G) 263
6:12 263
7:2 263
11:2 263
13:4 (S) 263
15:1 263
16:3 (S) 263

Book of Giants (Manichean)
(Kawân fr. *j*) 295
M 625 (fr. D) 295

1 Enoch
6 299
6:1–2a *299*
6:6 *120, 298*
6–11 110, 117, *298*
9:1 *412*
10:1–3 305, 368
10:3 305
10:11–15 *298*
10:13–16 *127*
10:16 *304*, 306
12–14 *112*
12:4 139
14 *203*, 204, 209–210, 214, *403*
14:9–18 202
14:18–19 *411*
14:21 *403*
15:1 *139*
16:3 *378*
32:6 *152, 241*
37–71 207, *242, 410*
37:1 *152, 241*
39 207
39:14 207
40:9 *217, 412*
41:1 116, *136, 177*
41:1–3 180
52:2 180
54:6 *412*
60 368
60:1–10 *368*
60:8 *152, 241*
62:5 *410*
67 368
69:9–11 *152, 241*
69:29 *410*
71 146, *242*, 410–413, 416
71:1 *411*
71:3–5 411
71:5 411
71:7 *411*
71:8 411
71:8, 9, 13 *412*
71:11 *412*
71:11–12 412
71:14–15 *412*
71:14–17 412
72:1 116, *136, 177*
74:2 *114*, 116, *136, 139, 177, 322, 413*
80:1 116, *136, 177*
81:6 *139*
85–90 205
85:3 *152*, 241
87 205, 214
87:3–4 205
89:9 241, *384*
89:36 241
89:50 *205*
89:59 295
89:73 *205*
90:37–38 *152, 241*
106 369, 391, 394, *425, 432*
106–107 371, *432*
106:2 391–392
106:3 373, 392
106:5 *391, 425*
106:15–19 369
106:16–18 374

2 Enoch
1:3 165
7 252, *299*
7:3 252
7:4–5 *265*

8:3–4 262
8:5 264
9 142
18 118, 215–216, 221, 298–*299*
18:3 *253*, 298
18:8–9 215, *216*
21–22 *170*, 217, 250, 252
21–38 145–146
21:1–22:10 412
21:2 *412*
21:3 *217*
22 113, 146–147, *153*, *156*, 170–173, 214, 220, *221*, 233, 235, 243, 259–261, 263, 268, 282, 313, 317–318, 402, *403*, 411–412
22:1–4 *259*, *274*, 313, *402*
22:5–6 *412*
22:6 141, *170*, *217*, 251, 319, 411
22:6–7 141
22:6–10 *269*, 416
22:7 409
22:8–9 319, 411
22:9 231, 261
22:11 139, 387
22–23 413
23:1–2 137, 184
23:4 139–140, *168*, 322
23:4–6 *114*
23:6 139–140, 322
24 141, 177, 219, 256
24–26 191
24–36 176
24–32 356–357
24–33 195
24:1–2 220
24:2 *162*
24:2–4 184
24:3 137
28–29 186
28:2–4 186
28:3 189
29:3 190
30 *153*, 155, 161, *267*
30–32 195
30:8 *161*
30:8–11 261
30:8–32:2 *151*, *240*
30:9 266
30:10 157
30:11 174, *246*, 261, 263
30:11–12 *334*
30:12 157, 245
30:13 158, 161
31:3 *246*
33 115, 387
33:8–10 139
33:8–12 357, *370*
33:10 *151*, *240*
33:10–12 140, 183
34 357, *358*
35 345, 348, 357
35:1–3 345–346
35:2 345, 348, *349*
36 171, 409
36:3 138, 140, *217*, *409*
37 *260*, 274, 320, 351, 417
39 149–151, 157, 162–164, 166, 171, 173, 246–248, 259, 261, *267*, 268, 313, *315*, 318, 353
39–67 145, 183, 433
39:3–6 150–151, 172, 315–316, 408
39:3–8 314
39:5 162, *353*
39:6 163
39:8 *247*, 318
40 146
40:2–12 *164*
41:1 *151*, *240*
42:5 *151*, *240*
43 144, 227, 247–248, 409
43–44 145–146
43:1 146
44:1 *151*, 173, *240*, 260

46:1–2 247
48 *358*
48:9 357
50 146
51:4 *390*
53 265–266
53:1–4 *265*
56 145, 231–232, 433
56:2 *231*, 258
58 245, 249
58–59 249
58:1 *264*
58:1–3 *151, 240*
59 366, 389, 433
61:1–5 *390*
62:1–2 *390*
62:2 *265*
64 234–235, 247, 264–265, *266*
64–65 266
64:1 *248*
64:2 352
64:3–5 *173, 260*
64:4 *235, 352*
64:4–5 *167*, 234, 265
65 266
65:8–10 266
67 433
67–69 214
67:2 138
68 427
68–69 *383*
68–72 *379*, 427
69 390–393, 427
69:2 *264, 377*
69:2, 4 *392*
69:5 *264, 377, 392*
69:11–16 364, *379*, 427
70 364, 369, 379, 427
70:3 *264, 377*
70:4–10 369
70:8 *369*
70:10 *367*
70:21–22 365
71 371, 375, 383, 436
71–72 *363*
71:19 373
71:20–21 371
71:27–30 369
71:27 *369*
71:28 *151, 240*
71:29–30 375
71:31–32 *239*
71:32–33 *239, 371*
71:34–36 *239*
71:33–37 *370*
71:37 *367*
72 371, 436
73 *369*

4 Ezra
14 345

History of the Forefathers (Armenian)
40–45 118–119
45 120

Joseph and Aseneth
22:7–8 *418*

Jubilees
3:9–14 *206*
3:27 *363*
4 308
4:17 114, 116
4:22 117
4:23 *112*, 206, 308
4:24 *145*
4:25 *363*
5 368
5:5 *368*
7:1 306
7:38–39 *364*
8:1–3 *110*
10:1–14 307, 368
10:11b–14 *307*
10:13 *306*, 362
10:13–14 375
21 365, 376
21:10 362, 365, 367

Ladder of Jacob
1:3–10 *402*
1:6 405
2 414
2:7–19 404

2:15 405
2:18 405
3 401, 414
3:2 415
4 401

Life of Adam and Eve
3:1 *258*
4:2 258, *258*
13–15 *170*, *300*
13:2–14:2 *156*
21:3 394
27:1 *158*
35(9) 262
36(9):4 263
43(13) *263*
53 121

Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah
9:6 *206*

Prayer of Joseph
8 417

Sibylline Oracles
3 159
3:1–45 *158*
3:24–27 158

Testament of Abraham
11:4 (A) 155

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

Testament of Levi
§57 Mt. Athos *362*, 365

Testament of Benjamin
10:6 *206*

D. Dead Sea Scrolls

CD
2:17–19 296, 303
3:20 *336*

1Q19 *362*, 391–392, 394
1Q19 3 *391*
1Q19 13 *391*
1Q19 13:2–3 *392*

1Q20 *362*

1QapGen
1–17 *362*
2–5 371
2:19 *369*
5:12–13 *391*
6–7 368

2Q26 128, *129*

4Q171 335–336
4Q171 3:1–2 *335*
4Q171 3:11 *336*

4Q203 7 128
4Q203 8 *112*, *114*, *118*, 128
4Q203 8:3–4 128
4Q203 8:6–15 *129*

4Q374 339–343

4Q504 327–329, 334, 339–340, 343
4Q504 8 334
4Q504 8:4–6 *299*

4Q529–546 *293*

4Q530 124–125, 294–296
4Q530 3–12 294
4Q530 8 295

4Q534 *362*

6Q8 *362*
6Q8 2 296, *304*

E. Hellenistic Jewish Authors

Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian
67–90 353
72 *162*

Philo
Opif. (*De Opificio Mundi*)
88 *246*
148 *246*

QG (*Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin*)
1.32 154
4.23 228

Josephus
Ant. (*Antiquitates Judaicae*)
1.73 110
4.33 115
18.18 *367*

Zosimos of Panopolis 159

F. Targums

Fragment Targum
Gen 1:6 194
Gen 3:21 *330*

Targum Neofiti
Gen 3:21 *330*
Gen 28:12 *410*
Gen 32:25–31 414

Targum Onqelos
Gen 3:21 *330*
Gen 28:13–16 406
Gen 32:29 *417*

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Gen 3:21 *330*, *338*
Gen 28:12 407
Gen 28:13–17 406

Targum on Job
28:8 *187*

G. Mishnah and Talmuds

Mishnah
Abot 1:1 346, 348, *349*
Hag. 2:1 187
Tamid 4:1 367, 434

Palestinian Talmud
Ta'an.
68c *390*

Babylonian Talmud
Ber.
7a 211
18b *209*
Hag.
12a *166*, *186*
15a 114, *141*, 168, *169*, 322
Hul.
49a *211*
91b *407–408*
Ketub.
105b *211*
Ned.
32b 375, *376*, 428, 430
Sanh.
38b *167*
108b *119*
Sotah
12a 395
Ta'an.
26b *390*
Tamid
31b *367*, *434*
Yoma
77a *209*

H. Midrashim

Early Midrashim
Abot de R. Nathan (A)
2 375

Midrash Rabbah
Genesis Rabbah
8:1 160, 166, 169
11 332
20:12 *279*, 330
21:3 160
24:2 160
43:1 375

44:7 375
68:12 *407*, 408, *410*
78:3 *407*
82:2 *407*

Exodus Rabbah
1:20 395

Leviticus Rabbah
14:1 160
18:2 160
20:2 *279*, 332
34:3 *279*

Numbers Rabbah
4:1 *407*
12:12 208

Deuteronomy Rabbah
11:3 *282*, 331
11:10 395

Other Midrashim (arranged alphabetically)

Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael
1–4 *300*, 301
2 *253–254*

Midrash Tadshe
4 *282*, 331

Pesiqta de Rab Kahana
1:1 *166, 169*

Pirke de R. Eliezer
7 375
11 169
27 375
34 232
35 *407*
48 395

I. Mystical and Other Later Works

Alphabet of R. Akiba *169*

Chronicles of Jerahmeel
24:6–9 125
25 125
26 125
26:15–20 *126*
6–12 161

Raza Rabbah *352*

Sefer Ha-Bahir 187

Sefer Ha-Hashek 213

Sefer Haqqomah
155–164 *208*, 212

Sefer Yetsirah 187

Siddur Rabbah
37–46 *208*, 212

Tikkunei Zohar *167*

Zohar
I, 17b 192
I, 130b–131a 233
I, 231a 189
II, 11b 395
II, 222a 189
III, 207b–208a *253–254*

J. Hekhalot

Sefer Hekhalot/3 Enoch
1:9–10 (§2) 213
2:3 (§3) *211*
3 219, 256
3–13 *243, 153, 221*
3–15 (§§4–19) *147*
3–15/16 (§§4–19) *199*
4 (§§5–6) 254
4:1–10 254
4:5–6 *298*
5 (§§7–8) 298
5:5–6 302
5:9 *298*
5:9–10 *253*

8:1 (§11) *209*
9 (§12) 154, 166
(§12) 355
10 *141*
11:2 (§14) 116, *184*
11:2–3 181
15:1 (§19) *173, 260, 323, 352, 417*
15B 198–199, 209, 212–213, 352
15B:5 *323, 352*
16 (§20) 168
16:1–5 168
21–22 136
21:3 *136*
21:5 *136*
22:6 *136*
22:7 *136*
30 (§47) *248*
38 (§56) 136
45:1 *209, 413*
(§68) 355
(§§68–69) 355
47:1 *413*
48 *144*, 355–356
48A *355*
48C 167
48C:1 (§72) 234
48C:5–6 (§73) *154*
48D 185, 347–348, *355*
(§§77–80) 355
48D:8 *413*
48D:10 (§80) 345–346, 348, 358

Hekhalot Rabbati
§108 *413*
§164 *407*
§184 *172*
§189 *172*

Hekhalot Zutarti
§384 *162, 219, 255, 355*
§385 *200, 209–210, 219, 255*
§390 199, 212–213, *219*, 220, *255*
§396 *219, 255*
§§396–397 *352*

Merkavah Rabbah
§672 168
§688 164

K. Samaritan Sources

Memar Marqah
5·4 331

Pseudo-Eupolemus *369*

L. New Testament

Gospel of Matthew
1:25–30 *180*
18:10 *416*

Gospel of John
17:5 *277*

1 Corinthians
15:52 *284*

2 Corinthians
3 *336*
3:7 337
3:7–4:6 *341*
4:4 *277*

Philippians
2:5–11 *277*
2:6 *277*

Colossians
1:15 277
1:15–18a *104*
1:26 283

1 Peter
1:20 283

M. Christian and Gnostic Sources

Acts of Pilate
25 *206*

Apocalypse of Paul
20 *206, 351*

Apocryphon of John *156*

Apostolic Constitutions
8.5.3 *436*

Cave of Treasures
2:10–24 *170, 251, 300*

Chronography of George the Monk *112*

Chronography of John Malalas
1.5 112, 116

Chronography of Michael Glycas
114, 116

Chronography of Syncellus *127*

Clementine Homilies
17:7 *284*

Clementine Recognitions
1:52 *206*

Enthronement of Michael *170, 251, 300*

Gospel of Bartholomew
4 *170, 251, 300*

Irenaeus
Adversus Haereses
1.30.6 *156*

Macarian Homilies
I.2.3.14 *338*–339
I.2.12.7–9 340
II.1.1–2 *282*
II.1.7 338
II.5.11 337
II.5.10–11 *337*
II.12 *275, 281, 333, 339*
II.12.1 276, 334–335
II.12.6 335
II.12.8 276, 334
II.12.14 281, *339*
II.12.15 281
II.15.10 *281*
II.15.38 284–286
II.20 *340, 342*
II.20.1 342
II.20.4–5 342
II.20.6 340
II.20.7 341
II.30.7 338
II.32.4 *337, 342*
II.47.1 *337*

Melchizedek
5:19–20 *435*
5:20 435, 437
6:17 436–437

Origen
Princ. (De Principiis)
2.3.7 *284*

Palaea Historica 121–122

Philokalia
Pseudo-Simeon
4.72–73 269–270

N. Ancient Near Eastern Sources

Tablet from Nineveh
178–179
19 175

O. Qur'an

2:31–39 *170, 251, 300*
7:11–18 *170, 251, 300*
15:31–48 *170, 251, 300*
17:61–65 *170, 251, 300*
18:50 *170, 251, 300*
20:116–123 *170, 251, 300*
38:71–85 *170, 251, 300*

MODERN AUTHOR INDEX

Numbers in italics indicate passages which are cited only in the footnotes

Aaron, D.H., *276, 329*
Aberbach, M., *406*
Abrams, D., *197, 213*
Adler, W., *110, 112, 114, 116*, 117, *120, 127*, 130, *131*
Adrianova, V., *400*
Albani, M., *110*
Albeck, Ch. *125*
Alexander, P.S., *103, 116, 134–135, 137, 140, 147, 153, 165*, 166, *167–168, 173, 177, 181, 184*, 185, 197–198, *199, 209*, 210, *211, 213, 217, 219, 221, 234, 242*, 243–244, *248, 254, 256*, 260, 264, *274, 298, 302, 317, 323, 346, 347, 352, 355, 382, 405, 417, 419*
Altmann, A., *169–170, 198, 253–254*
Amusin, I.D., *133, 388, 423, 424*
Andersen, F.I., *114–115, 118*, 133, *134, 138–140, 142*, 143, *144–147, 150, 156–157, 162–164, 167, 172*, 173, *175–177, 182–186*, 188, *190–191*, 192, *193*, 195, *215–217, 219–220, 223, 226, 228–229, 231, 234–236, 239, 245–248, 250, 252–253*, 255, *256*, 257, *258–259*, 260, *262, 264–266, 269, 274*, 282, *289, 298, 313–314, 317–321, 322, 334, 345, 351, 352, 353, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 373, 374, 375, 378, 383*, 385, *387, 388, 390, 403, 404, 409, 412, 416, 423*, 425, *426, 428, 430, 431, 432, 434, 436*
Anderson, G.A., *111, 113, 121, 159, 251–252*, 253–255, *257–258, 300, 394*
Aptowitzer, V., 424
Argall, R.A., *159*
Augustin, C., *372*

Baillet, M., *327*
Bailey, L., *431*
Balentine, S.E., *316, 399*
Barc, B., *169, 253*
Barhudarov, S.G., *265, 358*
Barr, J., *271, 323*
Bauckham, R., 289, *299*
Behm, J., *277, 284*
Bekker, I., *114, 116*
Bergren, T.A., *103*, *123, 197, 234, 242, 244, 264, 361, 382*
Bernstein, M., *123, 361*
Berthelot, M.P.E., *159*
Berthold, H., *275, 333*
Beyer, K., *293*
Bianchi, U., *180*
Bickermann, E.J., *347*
Bietenhard, H., *197*
Black, M., *135, 139, 197, 227, 277, 305–306*
Bleeker, C.J., *134, 182, 223, 367, 385, 423, 434*
Bloch, R., *320, 328*
Blumenthal, D., *134, 224, 274*
Boccaccini, G., *206–207*
Bockmuehl, M., *180*, 181
Bonwetsch, G.N., *290, 385, 386, 388, 400, 423*, 425
Borsch, F., *223*
Böttrich, C., *103, 133, 153, 159*, 188, *223*, 239–240, 249, 261, 265–266, 268, *363, 377, 381, 382, 385, 388, 389*, 390, 391, 392, 393, *423*
Bousset, W., *388*
Box, G.H., *104*, 187–188, 194
Bow, B.A., *159*
Bowman, J., *395*
Brakke, D., *435*
Bratke, E., *400*

Brock, S., *276, 278, 329,* 330, *333, 342*
Brooke, G.J., *336*
Burchard, C., *418*
Burkitt, C., *223*
Burrows, E., 190

Campbell, A.F., *311*
Cancik, H., *155, 169, 254*
Caquot, A., *325, 424*
Cazelles, H., *328*
Cejtlin, R.M., *366, 415*
Charles, R.H., 117, *133,* 191–192, *223, 251, 322,* 385, *386,* 387, *388,* 390, *423,* 425
Charlesworth, J.H., *103, 114–116, 133, 135, 147, 150, 155, 156, 158, 175, 178,* 188, *223, 231, 234, 239, 242–243, 263, 269, 327, 334, 346, 364, 383, 385, 388, 402, 410, 423*
Chazon, E., *123, 152, 241, 301, 327, 334, 361, 391*
Chernus, I., *134, 224, 274*
Childs, B., 311
Chipman, J., *198*
Clark, E.A., *278*
Coats, G.W., *320, 328*
Cohen, M., *134, 149–150, 154, 163, 197, 201, 208, 212,* 213, *224, 272, 274*
Collins, J.J., *103, 123, 133, 135, 147, 158, 218, 223, 361, 385,* 388, *423, 431, 438*
Colson F.H., *246*
Cross, F.M., *180*

Daly, R.J., *278*
Dan, J., *197, 199, 243*
Danby, H., *347*
Daniélou, J., *133, 223*
Davies, W.D., *180*
Davila, J.R., *197,* 200, *209, 213, 242, 323, 352, 380, 399, 418*
De Boor, C., *112*
De Conick, A., *103, 171, 223, 272–273, 276, 314, 323, 329,* 331, *333, 352, 388, 399, 403, 416, 419*
De Jonge, M., *362, 424*
Delcor, M., *372,* 373, *388, 424, 432, 432*
Denis, A.-M., *388*
de Santos Otero, A., 188, *372, 385, 388, 423*
Desprez, V., *275, 333*
Deutsch, C., *211,* 357
Díez Macho, A., *188, 330, 372, 385, 406, 415, 423*
Dimant, D., *123, 339*
Dindorf, L., *113, 116*
Donaldson, J., *284*
Dörries, H., *275–276, 281, 284–286, 333, 334, 337, 339–340*
Du Toit Laubscher, F., *424*
Duchesne-Guillemin, J., *128, 294*

Eckart, K.-G., *290*
Ego, B., *203*
Eichrodt, W., *271, 316, 399*
Eisenstein, J.D., *125*
Eissfeldt, O., *388*
Ellis, E.E., *180*
Elior, R., *203, 210,* 211
Eppel, R., *110*
Evans, C.A., *123, 133, 245, 305, 327, 361*

Fair, I., *223*
Falk, D., *327*
Fauth, W., *198*
Fenton, R.B., *203*
Ferguson, E., *223*
Festugière, R.P., *159*
Finkelstein, L., *347*
Fishbane, M., *218, 271, 316, 325, 400*
Fischer, U., *133, 385, 389, 423, 438*
Fitzmyer, J.A., *341, 424*
Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T., *198, 242, 339, 388, 391,* 392–396, *410, 412*
Flint, P.W., *382*
Flusser, D., *110, 121, 271*
Forbes, N., 188, *386*
Fossum, J., *104, 133,* 155, 168, *169–170, 182, 190, 192, 223, 254, 276, 277, 319, 329,* 331, *332, 388, 406, 408, 410*
Fotheringham, J.K., 386–387

Fraade, S.D., *110, 120*
Franko, I., *400, 401, 403, 405, 415*
Freedman, H., *160, 167, 279, 282, 330, 331, 332, 395*
Friedländer, G., *161, 227, 233, 395, 429*
Frishman, J., *334*
Fujita, S., *306*

Gammie, J.G., *424*
García Martínez, F., *110, 112, 114, 123–124, 128–129, 293–294,* 296, *299, 303,* 306, *327, 328, 335–336, 340–341, 361–362, 374, 391, 424, 431–433*
Gaster, M., 125, *161*
Gaylord, H.E., 263, *289–290,* 291, *292–293, 297, 299,* 301, *302, 304–305,* 308
Gianotto, C., *424*
Gieschen, C.A., *388, 415, 418*
Ginzberg, L., *103, 110, 190, 211, 276, 388*
Gluck, T., *111*
Golitzin, A., *275, 338–341*
Goodenough, E.R., *413*
Gordon, C., *209, 248*
Goshen-Gottstein, A., *276, 279, 281–282, 329,* 331
Goetschel, R., *203*
Gould, G., *278*
Greenfield, J.C., *134–135, 188, 274, 362, 385, 388, 412*
Grelot, P., *110, 135, 178, 183, 324, 370, 377*
Grözinger, K.-E., *199*
Grossfeld, B., *330, 406, 429*
Gruenwald, I., *103,* 104, *134–136, 147, 150, 162,* 181, *182, 195, 198, 218, 224, 229, 271, 274, 388, 424*
Grünbaum, M., *227*
Gry, L., *133, 182,* 191, *223, 423*

Hafemann, S.J., *320, 328*
Hage, W., *290*
Halperin, D.J., *134, 198, 202, 204, 209, 218, 224, 274, 323,* 349, 350, *352,* 358, *419*
Hannah, D.D., *418*
Haran, M., *272, 320, 339*
Harlow, D., *291, 307*
Harnak, A., *388*
Hayward, R., *438*
Heinemann, J., *110, 121*
Hellholm, D., *133, 223, 385, 388, 423*
Hempel, J., *271, 323, 382*
Hengel, M., *110, 169, 198, 220, 254*
Hennessey, L., *278*
Henning, W.B., *127, 294,* 295, 301, *303*
Hercigonja, E., *290, 293*
Himmelfarb, M., *103, 198,* 202–204, *205, 214, 218, 220,* 289, *290, 388, 438*
Holladay, C., *317, 321, 328, 369*
Hollander, H.W., *362*
Hooke, S.H., *190*
Horton, F., *424,* 425, 430
Hurtado, L., *328*

Idel, M., *104, 134, 153,* 166–168, *169, 198, 224, 234,* 243, *275*
Ivanov, J., *290, 292–293*
Istrin, V.M., *400*

Jacimirskij, A.I., *400*
Jacob, E., *323*
Jacobs, L., *134, 224, 275*
Jacobson, H., *328, 354*
James, M.R., *400*
Janowski, B., *325*
Jansen, H.L., *110, 135, 178, 324*
Jastrow, M., *163, 426*
Jeffreys, E., *112, 116*
Jeffreys, M., *112, 116*
Jellinek, A., *125, 227, 282, 331, 347*
Janowitz, N., *134, 224, 275*
Jervell, J., *332*

Kahana, A., *150, 388*
Kamlah, E., *388*
Kapera, Z.J., *123, 361, 431*
Kaplan, C., *198*
Karpov, A.J., *290*
Kiley, M., *327*
Kim, T.H., *382*

Klein, M.I., *330, 407, 415*
Klijn, A.F.J., *110–111, 119, 124, 437*
Klostermann, E., *275, 333*
Knibb, M., *114, 116, 120, 136, 139, 147, 177, 180–181, 202, 205, 207, 242, 298–299, 304–305, 322, 391, 403, 410–413, 432*
Kobelski, P., *424*
Korpel, M.C.A., *271, 323*
Kraft, R., *111, 437*
Kroeger, M., *275, 333*
Kugel, J., *104, 400, 401*
Kuhn, K.G., *327*
Kuiper, K., *328*
Kurfess, A.M., *158*
Kurz, J., *186, 358, 366, 387*
Kushelev-Bezborodko, G., *400, 401, 403, 405, 415*
Kuz'min, A.G., *290*
Kvanvig, H., 115, *123, 135*, 178–179, *202, 324, 361*, 362, *368*, 431, *432*

Lake, K., *133, 223, 387*
Lambert, W.G., 178, *179, 325*
Langer, B., *325*
Lauer, R., *291*
Laurentin, M.R., *372*
Lavrov, P.A., *290, 293*
Layton, B., *111, 437*
Lemke, W.E., *180*
Levison, J.R., *246*
Lewis G.S., *197, 242, 323, 352, 399*
Lewis, J.A., *123, 361, 431*
Lihachev, D.S., *121, 400*
Lichtenberger, H., *155, 169, 254*
Lieberman, S., *198*
Loewe, R., *198*
Lüdtke, W., *290*
Lunt, H.G., 401, *402, 404–405, 411–412*
Luttikhuizen, G.P., *123, 245, 361*

Macdonald, J., *331*
Mach, M., *198, 388*
MacRae, G., *111, 437*
Maher, M., *330, 338, 406, 429*
Maloney, G.A., *276, 334*
Maier, J., *202, 218*
Marcus, R., *154, 342*
Markus, J., *283, 342*
Margaliot, R., *187, 189, 192–193, 198*
Marmorstein, A., *125, 271*
Martin, R.P., *277*
Martini, R., *125*
Maunder, A.S.D., 386–387, *423*
McCullough, W.S., *210*
McGuckin, J.A., *278, 283, 341*
McNamara, M., *223, 330, 407, 429*
Meeks, W., 317, *320*, 321, *328, 354*
Meshcherskij, N.A., *133, 223, 388, 423*
Mettinger, T.N.D., *271*, 272, *312*, 323, *324*
Meyer, W., *121, 277*
Michaeli, F., *271, 323*
Michel, O., *424*
Milik, J.T., *123, 125, 127–128, 134–135, 139*, 192, *198, 223, 293–294*, 295, 296, *300–301, 304–305, 322, 361, 363*, 387–388, *389, 413, 423, 425, 426, 431*
Miller, P.D., *180*
Moore, G.F., *198*
Moore, M.S., *206*
Mopsik, Ch., *198*
Morfill, W.R., *251, 290, 385, 386, 423*, 425
Morgan, M., *134, 224, 275*
Morray-Jones, C.R.A., *134, 198, 209, 275, 416–417, 419*
Mosshammer, A.A., *127*
Mozley, J.H., *121*
Munoa, P.B., *156, 265*
Murmelstein, B., *276, 329*
Murtonen, A.E., *198*

Neusner, J., *169, 328, 413*
Newman, C.C., *197, 242, 323, 352, 399*
Newsom, C., *134, 275, 339*
Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *123, 134, 147, 202, 204, 223, 361, 372–373, 431–432*
Niditch, S., *169*
Nitzan, B., *327*
Noth, M., 311–312

Novakovic, S., *290, 293, 299*
Noy, D., *110, 121*

O'Brien, M.A., *311*
Odeberg, H., 104, *134*, 135, *136–137*, 139, *140*, 141, *142*, 143–144, *147*, 187–188, 194, *197–198, 217, 221, 223*, 225, *227, 242, 274, 385, 388, 412–413, 423*
Oesterley, W.O.E., *104, 188*
Olson, D.T., *327*
Olyan, S., *400, 413–414, 418*
Orlov, A.A., *115, 123, 129, 186, 198, 225, 239, 244, 265, 275, 280, 328, 341*, 350, *362, 375, 379, 381–383, 390, 403, 409, 416, 423*

Palmer, G.E.H., *270*
Parry, D.W., *123, 361*
Paul, S.M., *110*
Paulsen, D.L., *278*
Pearson, B.A., *111, 159, 424, 435*, 436, 437
Pedayah, H., *198*
Petuchowski, J., *424*
Philonenko, M., *104, 134, 182*, 191, *223, 385, 388*
Philonenko-Sayar, B., *290*
Picard, J.-C., *291–292, 297*
Pines, S., *134, 182, 223*, 367, *385, 388, 423*, 434–435
Polzin, R., *320*
Pomerance, A., *164*
Pofir'ev, I.J., *400–401, 403*
Porter, S.E., *123, 361*
Propp, W., *320, 339*
Puech, É., *293, 327*

Quinn, E.C., *111, 263*
Quispel, G., 192, *273*, 275

Rappaport, S., *110, 339*
Reed, A.Y., *298*
Reeves, J., *117, 123*, 124, *125, 134, 152, 294*, 296, *297, 304, 361, 431*
Reicke, B., *180*
Reindl, J., *316, 400*
Repp, F., *220, 256*
Resner, A., *223*
Riessler *388*
Ringgren, H., *180*
Roberts, A., *284*
Robertson, R.G., *162*
Robinson, J.A., *290*
Romanides, J.S., *280*
Rowland, C., *206, 408*
Rowley, H.H., *224, 424*
Rubinkiewicz, R., *155, 221*
Rubinstein, A., *134, 224, 378, 387, 423, 425–426*, 430
Ruelle, C.-É., *159*

Sacchi, P., *188, 378, 385, 388, 423, 430*
Sachs, M., *227*
Saldarini, A.J., *347*
Salmina, M.A., *400*
Sanders, E.P., *156, 223*
Schäfer, P., *134, 149, 154–155, 163–164, 169, 181, 184, 198*, 200, *209, 213–214, 218–219, 224*, 234, *254–255, 275, 352, 407, 413*
Schalit, A., *328*
Schiffman, L.H., *211, 339*
Schlatter, A., *277*
Schlüter, M., *134, 149, 181, 184, 200, 224, 234, 255, 275, 407, 413*
Schmidt, N., *385, 388*
Scholem, G., 103–104, *134, 136*, 143, *147*, 149–151, *162*, 163, *167*, 174, *182–183*, 186–187, 191–192, *198, 217–218, 224*, 225, *229, 261, 275*, 277, *278–279*, 282–283, *315, 347, 385, 388, 423, 435*
Schrader, E., *178, 324*
Schreiner, P., *291*
Schultz, J.P., *328*
Schürer, E., *388*
Scopello, M., *134, 147*
Scott, J.M., *123, 202, 327, 361*
Scott, R., *112, 116*
Scroggs, R., *277*
Séd, N., *135, 275*
Segal, A., *165, 168, 169, 198, 223, 254, 388, 419*
Shachter, J., *167*

Sherrard, P., *270*
Simon, M., *160, 189, 193, 233, 279, 282, 330–332, 395, 424*
Simpson, P., *202*
Skjærvø, P.O., *294*
Smelik, W., *325*
Smith, J.Z., *412–415*
Smith, M., *134, 224, 274, 316, 325, 400*
Smith, R., *424*
Sokolov, M.I., *142, 150, 163, 175–176, 187, 193, 215, 219, 232, 245, 255–256, 265, 289–290, 346, 353–354, 356–357, 365, 367, 369, 385–388, 423, 436*
Sokoloff, M., *194*
Sparks, H.F., *400*
Speranskij, M.N., *121, 150, 175, 215, 232, 245, 346, 365, 385, 424, 436*
Sperber, A., *330*
Sperling, H., *189, 193, 233, 395*
Speyer, W., *110*
Sreznevskij, I.I., *143–144, 186, 226, 358, 366, 415*
Staerk, W., 276
Stähli, H.P., *325*
Steckoll, S., *438*
Stein, B., *272*
Stein, S., *198*
Steiner, R.C., *123, 361–362*
Stemberger, G., *125*
Stichel, R., *291*, 372, *388*
Stone, M.E., *103, 110–111, 113, 116*, 117, *119*, 120, *121, 123, 134–135, 152, 156, 159*, 170, *180, 197, 224, 234, 239, 241–244*, 250–252, *258, 263*, 264, *299–301, 307, 324, 361, 362*, 363, *365*, 370, *377, 382, 385, 388, 391, 394, 424, 437*
Stork, H., *424*
Strack, H.L., *125*
Stroumsa, G., *157, 164, 198, 227–228, 278*
Stuckenbruck, L., *125, 198, 294*, 295–296
Strugnell, J., *339*
Sundermann, W., 128, *294*
Suter, D.W., *242*
Svjatskij, D., *400*
Swartz, M.D., *135, 211, 218, 225, 275, 346*, 347, *348*
Székely, S., *388*
Szold, H., *211*

Thackeray, H., *109–110*
Thompson, C., *223*
Thompson, J., *223*
Thrall, M.E., *283, 342*
Tigchelaar, E.J.C., *113–114, 124, 128–129, 294, 296, 299, 303, 327–328, 335–336, 340–341, 374, 391, 432–433*
Tihomirov, M.N., *144, 225, 409*
Tihonravov, N.S., *290, 292–293, 400, 401, 403*
Tiller, P., *241, 306, 384*
Tishby, I., *141–142, 167*, 187, *198*
Tromp, J., *156, 251, 328*
Turdeanu, É., *121, 291, 377*
Tvorogov, O.V., *121, 400*

Ulrich, E., *123, 361*
Urbach, E., *198, 218*
Uspenskij, V.M., *401*

Vaillant, A., *134*, 143, *175–176, 187*, 191–192, *193, 224, 226, 239, 369*, 388, *403, 424*, 425, *438*
Vajda, G., *198, 424*
Van De Water, R., *328*
Van der Horst, P.W., *316*, 321, *322, 328*
Van der Toorn, K., *206*
Van der Woude, A.S., *424*
Van Rompay, L., *334*
Van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M., *245*
VanderKam, J., *109*, 110, *114*, 117, *118, 123, 134–135, 178*, 205–206, *223, 242, 247, 306–308, 322, 324, 325, 361–365, 368, 375, 382, 410, 424, 431*
Vermes, G., *413, 415, 418*
von Mutius, H.G., *134, 149, 181, 184, 200, 224, 234, 255, 275, 407, 413*
Vassiliev, A., *121–123*
Vtoryh, N.M., *400*

Wacholder, B.Z., *223, 426*
Waldstein, M., *156*
Ware, K., 270
Weinfeld, M., 271–272, *273, 312, 315,* 319, 323, *324*
Weinstein, N., *227*
Weiss, J., *277*
Werblowsky, R.J.Z., *134, 182, 218, 223, 367, 385, 423, 434*
Werline, R.A., *159*
Werman, C., *123, 361*
Whitaker, G.H., *246*
Wicks, H., *224*
Wilcox, M., *180*
Wintermute, O.S., *139, 144–145*
Wirszubski, Ch., *218*
Wise, M.O., *336*
Wisse, F., *156*
Wolfson, E.R., *198, 407*
Wuttke, G., *424*

Zimmern, H., *178, 324*
Zagrebin, B.M., *291*

SUPPLEMENTS

TO THE

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM

50. Yarbro Collins, A. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10587 5
51. Menn, E. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis.* Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10630 8
52. Neusner, J. *Jerusalem and Athens.* The Congruity of Talmudic and Classical Philosophy. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10698 7
54. Collins, J.J. *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10752 5
55. Baumgarten, A.I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10751 7
56. Scott, J.M. (ed.). *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10676 6
57. Henten, J-.W. van. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People.* A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10976 5
58. Feldman, L.H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 10839 4
59. Morray-Jones, C.R.A. *A Transparent Illusion.* The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism: A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11337 1
60. Halpern-Amaru, B. *The Empowerment of Women in the* Book of Jubilees. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11414 9
61. Henze, M. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar.* The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11421 1
62. VanderKam, J.C. *From Revelation to Canon.* Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Tempel Literature. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11557 9
63. Newman, C.C., J.R. Davila & G.S. Lewis (eds.). *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism.* Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11361 4
64. Liesen, J.W.M. *Full of Praise.* An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12-35. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11359 2
65. Bedford, P.R. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11509 9
66. Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. van. *Primaeval History Interpreted.* The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the book of Jubilees. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11658 3

67. Hofmann, N.J. *Die Assumptio Mosis.* Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11938 8
68. Hachlili, R. *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-armed Candelabrum.* Origin, Form and Significance. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12017 3
69. Veltri, G. *Gegenwart der Tradition.* Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11686 9
70. Davila, J.R. *Descenders to the Chariot.* The People behind the Hekhalot Literature. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11541 2
71. Porter, S.E. & J.C.R. de Roo (eds.). *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 11609 5
72. Scott, J.M. (ed.). *Restoration.* Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11580 3
73. Torijano, P.A. *Solomon the Esoteric King.* From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11941 8
74. Kugel, J.L. *Shem in the Tents of Japhet.* Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12514 0
75. Colautti, F.M. *Passover in the Works of Josephus.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12372 5
76. Berthelot, K. *Philanthrôpia judaica.* Le débat autour de la "misanthropie" des lois juives dans l'Antiquité. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12886 7
77. Najman, H. *Seconding Sinai.* The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11542 0
78. Mulder, O. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50.* An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12316 4
79. Burkes, S.L. *God, Self, and Death.* The Shape of Religious Transformation in the Second Temple Period. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12954 5
80. Neusner, J. & A.J. Avery-Peck (eds.). *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective.* An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning (2 vols.). 2003. ISBN 90 04 12987 1 (set)
81. Coblentz Bautch, K. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19.* "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen". 2003. ISBN 90 04 13103 5
82. García Martínez, F., & G.P. Luttikhuizen. *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome.* Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst. 2003 ISBN 90 04 13584 7
83. Najman, H. & J.H. Newman (eds.). *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation.* Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13630 4
84. Atkinson, K. *I Cried to the Lord.* A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13614 2
85. Avery-Peck, A.J., D. Harrington & J. Neusner. *When Judaism and Christianity Began.* Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13659 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 13660 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 13661 4 (Volume II)
86. Drawnel, H. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran.* A New Interpretation of the Levi Document. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13753 X

87. Berthelot, K. *L'«humanité de l'autre homme» dans la pensée juive ancienne*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13797 1
88. Bons, E. (ed.) «*Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice …*». Recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13677 0
89. Chazon, E.G., D. Satran & R. Clements (eds.). *Things Revealed*. Studies in Honor of Michael E. Stone. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13885 4
90. Flannery-Dailey, F. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*. Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12367 9
91. Scott, J.M. *On Earth as in Heaven*. The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13796 3
92. Richardson, P. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14131 6
93. Batsch, C. *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13897 8
94. Hachlili, R. *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 12373 3
95. Bakhos, C. *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13871 4
97. Neusner, J. *Contours of Coherence in Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14231 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 14436 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 14437 4 (Volume II)
98. Xeravits, G.G. & J. Zsengellér (eds.). *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20-21 May, 2004. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14376 9
99. Rosenfeld, B-Z. & J. Menirav (Translated from the Hebrew by Chava Cassel). *Markets and Marketing in Roman Palestine*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14049 2
100. Collins, J.J. *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture*. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14438 2
101. Neusner, J. *Rabbinic Categories*. Construction and Comparison. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14578 8
102. Sivertsev, A.M. *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14447 1
103. Beyerle, S. *Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalyptik*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13116 7
104. Sievers, J. & G. Lembi (eds.). *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14179 0
105. Davila, J.R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*. Jewish, Christian, or Other? 2005. ISBN 90 04 13752 1
106. Bakhos, C. (ed.) *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13870 6

107. Feldman, L.H. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14906 6
108. Brutti, M. *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*. History, Ideology, Theology. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14910 4
109. Veltri, G. *Libraries, Translations, and "Canonic" Texts*. The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14993 7
110. Rodgers, Z. (ed.) *Making History*. Josephus and Historical Method. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15008 0
111. Hempel, C. & J. M. Lieu (eds.) *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb. 2006. ISBN 90 04 13997 4
112. Grappe, Ch. & J.-C. Ingelaere (éds.) *Le Temps et les Temps* dans les littératures juives et chrétiennes au tournant de notre ère. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15058 7
113. Cappelletti, S. *The Jewish Community of Rome*. From the Second Century B. C. to the Third Century C.E. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15157 5
114. Orlov, A.A. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15439 1, ISBN-10: 90 04 15439 6
115. Macaskill, G. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15582 4, ISBN-10: 90 04 15582 1
116. Dvorjetski, E. *Leisure, Pleasure and Healing Spa Culture and Medicine in Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15681 4, ISBN-10: 90 04 15681 X
117. Segal, M. *The Book of Jubilees Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15057 7, ISBN-10: 90 04 15057 9
118. Xeravits, G.G. & J. Zsengellér (eds.). *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15700 2, ISBN-10: 90 04 15700 X

ISSN 1384-2161